

H
114

David's evening sermon in
which is a full description
of the morning's discourse
The Wants of the People
See letters to the Editor of
The Morning Post as also
in the King's Veto in the States
of Roman Catholic Bishops
to Mr. Wellesley, Secretary for
registering Charitable Donations
Brief Narratives & History
with the consent of Mr. Wellesley
letter to Lord Camden containing
a collection of laws relating
with the late Acts
letter to the Hon. Lord Rivers &
Bartholomew & the Bishop of Exeter

DANIEL'S
EVENING VISION

COMPARED WITH

HISTORY:

IN WHICH IS DISCLOSED,

A

Prophecy

CONCERNING

BONAPARTE.

BY THE AUTHOR OF LA REVOLUTION—VISION.

Printed at Paris.

Ne méprisez pas les Prophéties.

PAUL.

“ Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie.”

HABAKKUK, ii. 2 & 3.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JORDAN AND MAXWELL, 331, STRAND,
OPPOSITE SOMERSET-HOUSE.

PRICE ONE SHILLING.

**Macpherson, Printer, Russell Court,
Covent Garden.**

PREFACE.

THE French Revolution, which shook *the city* * of privilege in the civilized world, and destroyed *a tenth part* of it, broke the seal, and opened the book of prophecies; and in the year 1798, the author discovered that a history of this revolutionary period was written in the book of Revelation, and also in the more ancient books of prophecy; and since that period he has had the satisfaction in finding that he was not mistaken:—for history has realized many of the predictions exactly in the order in which they are written, and now presents a sublime prospect, that the whole may be shortly accomplished—for, be it peace or war, the revolutionary world goes round, and every day seems to accelerate its motion. •

During the first revolutionary wars, when the world groaned for peace, and when at length it was gratified, *the signs of the times* foretold a long period of tranquillity; for it could not then have been

* Rev. xi.

supposed, that any nation in the civilized world would call as loud for war as it had done for peace; yet the Oracle of God uttered a different language; and the author read, in the inspired book, that peace was a delusion—that it would be merely the awful suspension of hostilities—that the war factions, called *the dragon, the beast, and the false prophet*, who had been conquered, and whose predictions had been falsified; and who, to appearance, were politically dead, would rise again; and by their miraculous powers—by influence and deep intrigue—by their predictions and great sophistical arguments make war popular, and bring *the whole political world* upon its dreadful theatre; and that the Coalition would be recreated and set up, *one thousand two hundred and ninety days* after the First Consul had given us peace. It was *set up* at the time appointed by the Oracle of God.—But the end is not yet. ‘

In the same book he has read the history of the new coalition war, its consequences, and its glorious result. In the Apocalypse it commences at chap. xvi. 16.—*The seventh avenging angel*, indignant at the princes of Europe breaking their sacred treaties of peace, and forming anew the desolating Coalition which threatened to deluge, in a torrent of calamity the kingdom of the peace-makers, and crush the power of their favourite sovereign, *poured out his awful vial into the air*, which electrified every nation, and set the world on fire,—and it is a fire that cannot be quenched. This sudden, unexpected, and terrible stroke of mighty power and

tremendous majesty, astonished, confounded, and affrighted all nations. In the language of prophecy, the earth quaked; the Heavens trembled; the sun and the moon turned pale, and darkness veiled the stars. No sooner had the vial been poured out, than *a great voice from the temple of peace**, and *from the throne*, triumphantly announced its great and immediate operation to this effect:—“*IT IS DONE*—the great work of years “ is effected in a few months. The mighty Coalition is broken in pieces with a tremendous crash, “ and a world is conquered. *It is done*, almost “ instantaneously, *as it was in the day of Midian*, “ by which means Europe is saved from the scourge “ of war, the safety of France secured, and its dominion established.”

In consequence, the present period is the exulting and agitated epoch of the *voices*. The annihilation of an army at Ulm, and the battle of Austerlitz has filled the world with voices. In the favoured empire it was the voice of triumph, joy, and thanksgiving: in every other country it was the voice of lamentation. In this great kingdom of intelligence has been heard the voice of fear, the voice of despair, and the voice of accusation. New voices have also been heard from different causes.—England and Spain have, each of them, heard a voice from America: Prussia has heard a voice from England: Holland, Switzerland, Rome, Portugal, and other regions, have heard a

* The senate-house where peace was given to the world. It is called in the prophecy, *the temple of heaven*, for peace is heaven.

PREFACE.

voice from France.—And while the joyful voice of peace echoes from shore to shore, and is heard in the distant parts of the earth, the empire of Germany is made to hear an unexpected voice from the conqueror of Europe. How long this epoch will continue it does not appear; but before it is ended, France, who has given it its name, is destined to hear a new voice from the Coalition.

The next will be the awful epoch of the *thunders and lightnings*—the thunders of the God of battle. The world will again, for a short period, be involved in all the horrors of war, which, perhaps, for violence will exceed all those that have preceded it. Thunders will naturally produce lightnings, which, probably, will create a universal consternation. Nations, it may be supposed, will be shocked, convulsed, and set on fire:—*and there shall be signs in the sun, and in the moon, and in the stars; and upon the earth distress of nations with perplexity,—the sea and the waves roaring; mens' hearts failing them for fear, and for looking after these things which are coming upon the earth, for the powers* of Heaven shall be shaken by a mighty earthquake.*—This will make the grand and awful revolutionary epoch.

In this earthquake (a) *all nations* will be shaken. *The elements† will melt with fervent heat; the*

* The high powers in church and state that are not founded on the rock of reason.

(a) See Appendix.

† Ignorance, prejudice, superstition, and scepticism—the elements of error.

sun[‡] and the moon will be darkened, and the stars* shall fall from Heaven.*

In the vision John beheld *the cities of the nations fall, and every island† fled away, and the mountains‡ were not found.*

The last will be the epoch of desolation—when, it may be, every abomination in the whole inhabitable earth will be swept away by the predicted tremendous *hail (a)*, the Almighty “besom of destruction.”—In this manner the earth, as it now is, and the things that are therein, will be dissolved; for if man is to be blessed with *a new heaven and a new earth*, the present heaven and the present earth must *pass away*; nor can it pass away without a mighty convulsion—without *a great noise*.

During the operation of this vial, we learn, that the glorious coming of Christ will take place. He announceth that he shall *come as a thief*, nor doth it appear at what *day or hour*, nor even in what year he will surprise the world, and surprise it he will, if he comes at this period; for *who hath believed the report?* The coming of Christ may reasonably be supposed to signify the manifestation of *the word*, for the word is Christ. This glorious manifestation will be a new revelation, wisely adapted to a philosophical age, and to an intelligent people, capable of receiving the most sublime and heavenly truths, such as will make men wise and happy, and

* Churches not built on the rock of truth.—They are the imperfect lights of the world, and must be darkened on the rising of *the sun of righteousness*.

† Ships of war.

standing armies.

enable them to realize a heaven upon earth, agreeable to the promises. This mighty word, although written in an ancient book, read and studied during many ages, is still enveloped in *the clouds of heaven*, the clouds of sacred, sublime obscurity : and when it comes into the world, it will come with *power and great glory*. All knowledge is powerful, but this knowledge will be all-powerful. At first it was *a little stone cut out of the holy mountain* of knowledge, *without hands*, by history alone ; but it has increased, and it will become, on a sudden, a visible *great mountain*, and dash to atoms the mighty empire of despotism, *and fill the whole earth*. Thus thunders, and earthquakes, and prophecies, *will shake all nations*, that peace, liberty, and happiness, *the desire of all nations, may come*.

We are assured, from the highest authority, that the predicted *days of vengeance*, the subject of the Jewish prophets, were not fulfilled in the ancient world. That they did not relate to the fall of the ancient kingdoms and empires, is evident from the words of Jesus, who himself prophecied concerning them. Nor were they fulfilled in the dissolution of the Jewish state and nation, to which the prophecies of Jesus are supposed to refer, for they continued to be the subject of prophecy with the apostles, who spake of them as events destined to take place at a distant period of the world ; and the last of them who prophecied, describes them under the imagery of the *seven vials of wrath*. The *days of vengeance* therefore, were wisely reserved by the Supreme Governor of the world, till these *latter days* of light

and knowledge, when discipline may produce its intended effect.

In the prophetic history of this period, the names of persons, place, and things, are necessarily taken from the ancient vocabulary ; and if they are appropriate names, it is as much as we could wish ; and it appears, that allusions are made to ancient history as typifying the present, which is the proper subject of prophecy, and which every day is realizing. It is impossible that ancient history can be the grand subject of prophecy, for its correspondences are imperfect ; nor were those glorious effects produced by their supposed fulfilment which were announced by the prophetic trumpet, and sung in strains of the highest sublimity—the *judgments* of the ancient world did not teach the *nations righteousness*. Surely in writing the history of this revolutionary period, the prophets may have made allusions to events that had not occurred with the same ease as if they really had ; so that ancient history was the subject of prophecy only so far, as it presented images and types to delineate that which is infinitely more grand and interesting. Some glorious exceptions, however, must be admitted to this general statement. Yet the imperfect manner in which many prophecies have been fulfilled by ancient events, has produced an abundance of faith, that God was their author ; but they have not, in this prying age, stood the test of deep investigation. The day, however, the author is confident in asserting, is not far off, when every objection, to all of them, will vanish, and the

author of them will be both justified and glorified by the whole civilized world.

If the grand design of prophecy was to regenerate the world—to make men universally wise, virtuous, and happy; and to be fulfilled in an age ripe for regeneration, and this is that age; and if the book was sealed up, so that no one could read it till history should break the seal, it follows, that we who are permitted to read it, and not the people of any former age who could not read it, are the persons to whom the prophet's address. To us, therefore, doth the oracle announce—*the time is near*: and *this* must be the destined generation that *shall not pass away till all things*, written by the prophets, *are fulfilled*.

If these things are so—if *these are*, in reality, *the days of vengeance*—if *the kingdom of heaven is at hand*—if Christ is actually *coming in the clouds of heaven*, and *is near, even at the door*, what manner of persons ought we to be in all holy conversation and godliness; for if we wish to avert predicted judgments, we must reform—we must *turn every one from his evil way, and from the violence that is in his hands*. But unless we are convinced that we are in a state of transgression, we can have no motive to reform; nor unless we see our danger shall we look up for salvation; certainly if the precipice is in our road, and we have no light, our destruction is inevitable. The knowledge of, and the belief in the prophecies, therefore is absolutely necessary for our safety: it is in this *day of wrath* the one thing

needful. It was this faith that saved Nineveh—it was the want of it that Jerusalem was destroyed.

The opinion which the author has formed from the prophetic writings concerning the high destiny of Bonaparte, if true, is wonderfully sublime, and must be interesting in the highest degree. It appears to him, what at present seems almost impossible, that he will be subdued by the coalition-power, and in the desperate and humble situation in which he will be placed, he will give the most profound consideration to the book of prophecies, in which he will read his past extraordinary history, and learn, that he is commissioned by Heaven to pave the way for the reign of the saints, who will revolutionize the world in righteousness, and set up the empire of reason, truth, and virtue.

We may, therefore, by this new light, see some shades of his future character and history. Convinced and enlightened with new light, his astonished mind is elevated above despotic thrones, and enslaved kingdoms.—His ambitious spirit, touched with the sacred fire, takes the right direction, and it leads him to virtue and to heaven. He is, in truth, born again, and enters into a new world, where power is given him to do the will of God and his Redeemer. The believers support his cause, and *in that day* they are *many*. Armies of the new-born sons of God follow him in sure and certain hopes of victory, and the fruit of their warfare is righteous, peace, and *assurance for ever*.

When his great work is done in the civilized world, the sovereignty, and *the greatness of the*

kingdom, will be given to the people of the saints of the Most High. Yet he will not be uncrowned, for he will receive from God and from man the vast dominion of the uncivilized world, where he will set up the standard of truth for all nations, and gather together the dispersed of Judah from the four corners of the earth.

Nothing short of demonstration could satisfy the author, that his novel application of this prophecy is just and true;—that demonstration consists in its perfect correspondence, in every word, with history: for every application of prophecy that cannot produce this criterion, ought not to be admitted on the roll of truth. The prophet's *morning vision* will give an additional demonstration to it—for we have there a history of another great person, whose power over the Revolutionary World was *mighty*; and who is the only person that could, with propriety, be given as an accompaniment picture to *the little horn*.

This prophetic history appears to have been typified by Antiochus Epiphanes, who made a desolation in the holy land of religion—for his impious acts seem to be abated to; so that, with respect to the character of Gomapete, as a destroyer in the sacred kingdom of Liberty, the king of Syria may be called his prototype.

August 1808.

The Oracle of God concerning Bonaparte as a Hero, a Revolutionist, and a mighty Sovereign.



DANIEL'S EVENING VISION. CHAP. viii. 8—17.

Yet a little while, and (as a Despot) he shall not be.

ARGUMENT.

In Daniel's supernatural visions concerning *the evening and the morning* of the day of the Lord, the great day of prophetic history, two very extraordinary persons make their appearance on the revolutionary theatre, whose history and character must be supposed to be peculiarly interesting to make it the subject of prophecy. The first and chief, who is the subject of this vision, is exhibited rising out of the ruins of a great monarchy, and advancing, from a low station, by grand and mighty strides to imperial glory, power, and dominion. By his mighty arm the existing order of things are changed—a desolation is made in the sacred land of liberty—and his new and active government, and the exercise of his vast power, is crowned with *prosperity*—yet its awful days are numbered, and, if evil, they are few, and a most glorious restoration is foretold.

By comparing this prophecy with history, it appears to correspond, with perfect exactness, to that of the present sovereign of France, and to no other person.

HISTORY.

THE French Revolution in the political world was “a great earthquake;” and after it had swallowed up “the names” or titles “of men” formed a tremendous volcano, which dissolved the monarchy. Out of its ashes and out of its smoke has arisen the subject of this history, who has reared new pillars to the falling empire of despotism;—and by his heroism and revolutionary works has given an enlightened age a new history that has no parallel.

During the first epochs of the Revolutionary World, when the revolutionary spirit with the “besom of destruction” swept away the ancient order of things, and Frenchmen, animated with the ~~idea~~ of Liberty, strengthened with her strength, and elevated by her promises, broke in pieces, and finally dissolved a mighty and tremendous Coalition, formed to oppose the revolutionary spirit, and defend the rights of Kings—the Corsican—who now governs the Revolutionary World, and rules the nations with a rod of iron, was “a subject of rulers;” and if he contributed any thing to the revolutionary power, it was as the small dust of the balance—he was *little*. His elevation to the highest throne upon earth, and to absolute power and dominion, was progressive, yet wonderfully rapid; and it was obtained by sharpening and directing the dreadful sword, and by receiving from Fortune her greatest blessings.

His first rise to dominion astonished the world *to-ward the south* of Europe, in those fortunate but awful regions, which gave to the world its greatest heroes, revolutionists, and sovereigns, he acquired a mighty sum of fame, and made one stupendous step to the throne. Another mighty step was made

by a daring and tremendous invasion and conquest of that country *toward the eastern world*, which gave birth to and nursed the sciences ; for by this means he acquired additional fame : and while Fame seemed to have bestowed upon him his last honours, and Fortune to have betrayed him, by a sudden and bold resolution to save the greatness of the great nation, which was in a state of convulsion, agony, and death, he made a third advance, and it was a colossal stride to the throne ; for Fortune, whose favourite son he was, and in whom he confided, opened his prison door, and conveyed him, “ on the “ wings of the wind ” to the promised *pleasant land*, his desired haven. The man so heroic, and so fortunate, received from an enthusiastic people a crown of glory ; and Fame, with a mighty trumpet, proclaimed his name—wonderful. During these uncommon impressions the whole earth was moved, while a voice from the throne said unto him, “ Come “ up hither.” Thus *it waxed great, even to the host of heaven*, the high seat of power and glory, and perhaps the only heaven he aspired to. That mighty *host* of sovereigns who reigned there, and who had cast down thrones, and were terrible to the kings of the earth, appeared before him as grasshoppers ; and those of them that opposed his revolutionary proceedings, he hurled from their thrones. He was terrible also to *the stars* of reason—the illuminated and illuminating disciples of Liberty, whom he *cast* from their high and glorious spheres, and by *stamping upon them*, they ceased to enlighten the world. Deluded, perhaps, by ambitious facinating promises, he turned a deaf ear to the voice of wisdom, and refused the throne offered him by Liberty—a throne high and exalted in the realms of reason ; and the efforts of Equality, who attempted to set bounds to his power, he conquered. Thus beguiled by the serpent he chose the throne of despotism, and appointed himself First Consul—the *prince of the host*—and the host of sovereigns became only his subjects.

The first object of his reign was to quench the spirit of liberty ;—he threw water upon the coals on the altar, and ultimately *took away the daily sacrifice : and the place of his sanctuary*, through whose cloud capt tower he ascended into his heaven, the seat of glory, power, and dominion, was by the rolling thunders of despotism *cast down*.

France being at war in the cause of Liberty, the Corsican changed its object, and in her grand cause the people were no longer excited to fight, but for Peace. The change was highly gratifying to a people grown weary in making sacrifices to Liberty, for her laws they had broken, and her cause virtually abandoned. It was for this reason, the *reason of transgression*, that they raised their new sovereign a new host of warriors to enable him to conquer peace, and thereby to take away the bloody cost, *the daily sacrifice*.

Surely he was a tyrant in the kingdom of Truth, for, in order to make his throne secure, regardless of reputation and philosophical glory, he *cast down the power of political truth to the ground* ; this was done by suppressing the liberty of the press and the freedom of debate. *Even the daily sacrifice* : the sacred temple ; yea, all that was great and glorious in the new religion, was by tremendous power dissolved ; and, like the broken fabric of a vision, left not a wrack behind.

A new revolution had effected by a new despot, it was not to be expected that he would sit inactive on the throne ; no—in the enigmatical language of prophecy *he printed*. He made daring and mighty experiments upon the reason, the knowledge, and the feelings of a newly enlightened people, in order to discover how far he could realize a new despotic empire ; and trusting to his power and good fortune, he made experiments upon an hostile world, in order to try how far he could extend that empire, and he has prospered. That one

man should be able, with his own arm, to create out of the chaos of a democratical world a new empire, upon a scale so vast, and in so short a time, is the most astonishing of all human events; and it demonstrates, that the prophet spake emphatically in saying, *it practised and prospered*. He has indeed prospered.—Power, that sublimary god, co-operating with Fortune, has, perhaps, gratified every wish that his capacious mind was capable of receiving; they have even held out to him more crowns and kingdoms than he wishes to seize; while Liberty seems to have been utterly forsaken by them. If ever any man had a right to that highest of all titles, “King of Kings, and Lord of Lords,” he is that man,—but it is the accursed sword that hath given it him.

Although we cannot compare history with the glorious sequel of the prophecy, it is evident that the revolutionary world is not at an end, and its ages are seldom longer than a “time and times, and the dividing of time;” and if the mighty conqueror’s mountain now stands strong, and apparently immovable, it may suddenly vanish—nothing seems to be impossible in the revolutionary world. Although the Coalition is broken, and almost dissolved, it is not annihilated, and it may coalesce again, and conquer. But it may be said, that victory, in that case, would restore in France the ancient order of things, which would fix the mountain of despotism on a stronger foundation than on that on which it now stands, and annihilate the hopes of liberty. Be it so. The revolutionary world, like the natural, goes round, and another revolution, similar to the first, must come in its turn, and its coming will be with power and great glory, for the prophecies will give it heavenly sanction, and the saints of the highest order will direct its operations. Opposition will be conquered by that power which none can resist:—it will be disgraced by that glory which will irradiate

truth: and while the sun of righteousness shall shine in a cloudless day, unanimity, confidence, and faith, will give that power which can remove mountains, and establish the throne in righteousness; and it will be established upon a rock which cannot be moved, and that abideth for ever.

By this means, the vision may be realized, and "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of the Lord and his Christ, who will reign for ever and ever," without any miraculous interposition of Providence.

Prophecy with a Commentary.

PREDICTION 1.—Out of the tomb of Roman greatness, four great monarchies have arisen to support the empire of Despotism in the Christian world.

And when (it) was strong, the great horn was broken; that is, while the great horn was strong, it was broken; and for it, but not in its power, came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven, to support the empire of Despotism in the latter days.

2.—One of them being demolished. a Corsican soldier rises to the sovereignty out of its ruins.

And out of one of them came forth a little horn.

Out of the ruins of one of them, which was demolished by a great earthquake, has sprung up a little horn—little in its first growth, and little in rank and name, destined to sit upon the ancient throne, and hold the iron sceptre.

3.—He grows on the mountains and rivers of Italy—a giant in power.

It waxed exceeding great toward the South.

His first acquisition of power and glory was made *toward the South* of Europe, by turning the rivers and fountains of water into blood, shaking nations, and conquering peace.

4.—His growth is greatly increased in Egypt.

It waxed exceeding great toward the East,

His power and glory was wonderfully increased toward the eastern world, by the grandeur of his enterprises, and his revolutionary works.

5.—He grows still greater in his daring voyage to France.

It waxed exceeding great toward the Pleasant Land.

By a new enterprise, suddenly conceived, the object of which was the deliverance of the land of High Celebrity, his power and glory accumulated seven-fold.

6.—By ascending the high region of glory, power, and dominion, his greatness is consummated.

And it waxed great, even to the host of Heaven.

Having arrived at the *Pleasant Land*, he ascended above the heights of the political clouds, exalted his throne above the stars of reason, and the host of Heaven worshipped him.

7.—He maketh a revolution in Heaven.

And he cast down some of the host, and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them, which extinguished their lights.

His power in the kingdom of power being almighty, *he cast down some of the host*, who rebelled against him, and by hurling his thunderbolts among

the stars of reason, they fell to the ground; and in order to extinguish their lights, he stamped upon them with his terrible feet, and the kingdom of Liberty was darkened.

8.—He appointeth himself the high and mighty prince of princes.

Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host—and lo!—a host of princes cast their crowns at his feet.

9.—He quencheth the spirit of liberty.

And by him, the daily sacrifice (to liberty) was taken away.

By this new and daring sovereign, the sacred fire on the altar of political justice, was quenched. Then the incense, the treasure, and the victims, were devoted to the service of idolatry, ambition, and pleasure, and the sublime worship ceased.

10.—The Temple of Liberty falls.

And, in consequence of the restoration of despotism, the place of his sanctuary was cast down.

11.—He is supported in acting against the cause of liberty, by the fallen angels.

And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice, by reason of transgression.

The angels of the kingdom of Liberty having sinned and committed great abominations in her temple, their "love waxed cold," and the *daily sacrifice* became a burden to them, for which reason they gave their new sovereign a new army to fight against that great cause: to support which, they were created by the God of Liberty.

12.—He exerciseth his mighty power over the kingdom of Truth.

And it cast down the (power of) truth to the ground.

The throne of political truth, which is the support of liberty, and a terror to despots, he *cast down*, and trampled it under his feet.

13.—Having effected a revolution, he astonisheth and alarmeth the world by his unexampled actions, and revolutionary works.

And it practised.

He made peace and created evil—changed times, and laws—revolutionized thrones, and principalities, and powers—brought into existence a new empire and a new creation of princes and rulers—removed kings and set up kings—highly exalted his friends, and debased his foes—and did according to his active, powerful, ambitious will.

14.—In which he is wonderfully successful.

And it prospered.

In the exercise of his mighty power, both in the field and cabinet, and in the progress of his revolutionary career, he was wonderfully successful. Although the kings of the earth set themselves, and their great ministers took counsel together against him, they could not prevail nor resist his power: Fortune seemed to march before him, to loosen the joints of kings—to break in pieces the gates of brass, and cut the bars of iron in sunder: for it was ordained by heaven that he should prosper, and the will of heaven has been done.

15.—A disciple of Liberty enquires of the Oracle how long his kingdom is to lie desolate.

Then I heard one saint, who was illuminated by the prophetic writings, *speaking* concerning the new and awful aspect of the times, and the greatness of the signs. *And another saint*, wishing to know how long it was destined for the little horn to practise

and prosper in the empire of Despotism, said unto that certain saint, called the wonderful numberer, who spake by the light of the Oracle, *How long shall be the vision, or the visionary period, concerning the daily sacrifice ceasing, and the transgression of desolation in Liberty's promised land, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be disgraced, and trodden under feet? And he said unto me, unto two thousand and three hundred days, then shall the sanctuary be justified: that is, the representative government shall be justified, so that the stars of reason shall shine again with new and heavenly radiance:—the host being purified and made holy, shall regain their crowns—and the coals on the altar shall be re-kindled with fire from heaven.*

16.—Daniel, wishing to know the meaning of the vision, is informed, that it is a prophecy which will be fulfilled in the latter days.

And it came to pass, when I, even I, Daniel, had seen the vision, which astonished me exceedingly, and sought for the meaning, not knowing its design, then, behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man. And I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the nature and intention of the vision. So he came near where I stood: and when he came, I was afraid, and fell upon my face: but he said unto me, Understand, O son of man! for at the time of the end, at the great day of the Lord, shall the vision be realized in the history of a wonderful revolutionary period: therefore, see to it, that it is preserved as sacred among the Oracles of God, shut up and sealed till the destined day, when history shall break the seal and open the book. Then when many shall run to and fro, from one opinion to another—from error to truth, and back again from truth to error; and when the knowledge of the world shall be wonderfully increased, the book will be read, and he that readeth, will understand.

NOTES.

The Great Horn.—Horn is the symbol of power and strength, and in the prophetical language, signifies kings, or kingdoms, who support their power by the sword.

The He-Goat in the vision, we are told, represents the Grecian power, or empire. The NOTABLE HORN must be the Roman power: it was not one of the goat's natural horns, but one that grew up BETWEEN HIS EYES, in the very face of him, and became A GREAT HORN; and we learn from history that it became very troublesome to him, and eventually conquered him. It is called THE 1ST KING or power, and in history it stands paramount among the mountains of power. While this Horn was strong, it was BROKEN, even during the period that the Roman empire was the world itself, it was BROKEN by a power that came rushing like a hurricane from unknown regions. AND FOR IT CAME UP FOUR NOTABLE ONES TOWARD THE FOUR WINDS OF HEAVEN. The Christian world is very properly called HEAVEN: and it is apparent, that FOUR KINGDOMS have stood up in its place to support the empire of Despotism in our interesting times, and reared their pillars toward the four quarters of the Christian world, yet, NOT IN HIS POWER:—they do not inherit the Roman dominion. At the commencement of the French revolution, the monarchies of France, Austria, Prussia, and Russia, were NOTABLE HORNS:—they were strong armed nations, and if united, were able to defend the empire of Despotism against any power that could rise up against it. They have ever ruled on the principles of the ancient heathen monarchies, who knew not God, nor the Christian law of liberty, equality, and peace.

Out of one of them.—This expression implies, that the power out of which he came, was abolished.

The Little Horn.—The Corsican, in his present full-grown power, is still a LITTLE HORN, compared with Roman greatness, which is called THE GREAT HORN.

The Pleasant Land.—The disciples of Christ and Liberty have a land of promise as well as the Jews, and its “dominion shall be from sea to sea, and from the river to the ends of the earth.” That land is France: and it may be called by way of eminence, *THE PLEASANT LAND*. It is pleasantly situated—its climate is pleasant—its fruits are pleasant—and its inhabitants, so highly favoured by the God of nature, are, in consequence, a pleasant people.

The Host of Heaven.—In the language of prophecy, *HEAVEN* signifies the seat of glory, power, or dominion, either in the political, philosophical, or religious world. The seat of the representative sovereigns of New France, as being the seat of Liberty, and also of the highest power on earth, is therefore properly called *HEAVEN*: and it was illuminated with the *STARS* of reason. In such a heaven as this, there might be wars and revolutions. The metaphor is evidently borrowed, not from the abode of the blessed, but from our firmament.

It cast down some of the Host, &c.—In the expulsion of the courageous senators, who opposed the revolutionary proceeding of the Corsican, *SOME OF THE HOST WERE CAST DOWN*: and this act of violence operated as a thunderbolt upon the whole kingdom of Liberty, by which means the political *STARS* of light and reason fell to the ground, and their severe condemnation to banishment was giving *THE STARS A STAMP*, which extinguished their lights.

The Daily Sacrifice.—Never was any sacrifice offered up to any deity by any people, so flattering, so costly, and so bloody, as that offered up to Liberty by New France; and surely it may, with much propriety, be called a *DAILY SACRIFICE*. This awful sacrifice was professed to be made on the altar of political justice: and if the actions of Frenchmen had been consistent with their professions, and had their hymns of adoration and praise been accompanied with the incense of the heart, the act of taking it away till Liberty was satisfied, would have been a great evil: but as Frenchmen had, themselves, polluted the altar, and rendered themselves unworthy of offering Liberty, it was,

perhaps, a wise and righteous act—certain it is it was answering the loud and fervent prayers of humanity.

It was revealed to Daniel in another vision, “that from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate, set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days.” If, therefore, history has made a demonstration by its fulfilment, that the late revolutionary wars in the cause of liberty was the daily sacrifice alluded to, the author cannot be mistaken in his application of this prophecy. History informs us, that from the time Bonaparte gave peace to the British empire, till the coalition, called the third coalition, was set up, there was, in that period, 1,290 days. Peace was signed in London, October 1, 1801, and the coalition treaty was signed at Petersburg, April 11, 1805. Upon the supposition that the First Consul’s negotiator gave his answer to the British minister’s proposals two days before the treaty was signed, which is probable, the prophecy was fulfilled to a day, if not to an hour : an exactness which seldom occurs in any event that fulfilled any of the prophecies in ancient times.

As the late wars in the cause of liberty was, in France, a daily sacrifice—so the coalition may, with equal propriety, be called “an abomination that maketh desolate.” That all the princes of Europe should conspire to silence reason by the power of the sword—to destroy the new kingdoms of Liberty—and blow up with gunpowder the temple of Political Justice, is surely, of all abominations, the greatest that ever disgraced a civilized people. Nor is it less obvious, that it is a desolating power. It was created and organized to destroy, and it has “destroyed wonderfully :” and the desolation has been dreadful. It has made a desolation of principles, and of property, and of the rights of men and nations. It was, therefore, with the greatest propriety, that the Oracle has named the coalition, by way of eminence, in the regions of Sin, “the abomination of desolation ;” and when it shall “stand where it ought not, let him that readeth understand,”

The Place of his Sanctuary.—A representative government, or a free national assembly, is Liberty's sacred temple and sanctuary. It was this glorious edifice that gave political existence, strength and power to the Corsican ; and it has been, and it must yet be, HIS SANCTUARY, in case the coalition power shall rise up, and conquer.—for the house of despotism will afford him no shelter.

Two Thousand and Three Hundred Days.—If the author is not mistaken in his interpretation of this obscure prediction, a new revolution, similar to the first, will occur in France in the year 1808. History will confirm or reject it in a short time.

In order to apply the prophecies to past events, and also to the rise and fall of papal tyranny, a strange and preposterous liberty has been taken by commentators of Daniel's numeral predictions. Days have been arbitrarily made to signify years. Without divine authority, such liberties ought not to be taken with the sacred writings—a liberty never permitted with profane writings—never attempted, never thought of. O, SACRED SCRIPTURE, how hast thy knowledge and wisdom been perverted, and thy holy pages polluted, by thy best friends ! O, TRUTH, thou Lamb of God, thou hast been tortured, and “ slain from the foundation of the world,” by good, as well as bad men !



APPENDIX.

. *AND there was a great earthquake, such as was not since men were upon the earth, so mighty an earthquake and so great, &c.* Never till this period was the world in a situation to realize this prediction. Many politicians, without the light of prophecy, perceive the black horrific clouds, which announce tempests and earthquakes, hang over the political world, and “their hearts fail them for fear:”—they are indeed “in perplexity,” not knowing what to wish for—peace or war. Not to mention the lesser causes that may operate in effecting a universal revolution, the following may be sufficient :

1st, The vast empire which Bonaparte has so suddenly created is not built upon a rock ; and the predicted tempest may precipitate it into that wide abyss that lies beneath it, and bury it for ever.

2d, The golden chain, on which the fortunes of millions are suspended, may, by the present convulsions of nations, snap, and ingulph mountains of wealth.

3d, The seed that was sown in the earth at the beginning of the revolution, may, by a sudden change in the political sun, spring up (which the present unsettled and agitated state of nations renders possible) and operate a revolution in every part of Europe. All these things may work together and produce *an earthquake, such as never was since men were upon earth.*

Miserable must be that man who foresees the evil and not the good which will result from it. What ! does he not know that God has ordained thunders and lightnings, and

earthquakes, in the natural world to prevent greater evils? And can we suppose that he has appointed them to occur in the political world for no good purpose? Prophecy has lifted up the veil of futurity and presented us with a prospect, beyond the dark clouds full of fire, beautiful as paradise—glorious as heaven.

Great hail out of heaven, every stone about the weight of a talent. If common hail is the symbol of a great desolating power, what must that denote whose stones are a hundred weight? At the period alluded to we must suppose that France is irradiated with the sun of prophetic truth, when all hearts will be united to destroy every abomination upon the earth; and if her mighty armies should be sent into the uncivilized world to make a spoil of thrones, and principalities, and powers, in order to abolish idolatry, superstition, and despotism, a desolation will be made of a world full of abominations; and the prophet will be justified in making use of a figure so singularly strong, and seemingly hyperbolic:—and as it will be the effect of the operation of the prophecies, it may properly be called, *hail out of heaven*. Indeed France will then be *heaven*, so that it will apply, both directly and indirectly; and as it will fall upon an ignorant race of men, they will naturally blaspheme that God whose power and justice directed it to descend into their world: So that these expressions, “The man child shall rule all nations with a rod of iron; and the kings of the earth and the whole world,” may signify, not only the Christian, or the political world, but also literally, “the great globe itself.” Thus the act of recreating the Coalition, which in a confined sense has brought the “Kings of the earth and the whole world” upon the theatre of war, will eventually, in the fullest sense of the words, verify the prophecy, and gloriously accomplish all the prophecies concerning “the great day of the Lord.”

THE
WANTS
OF THE
PEOPLE,
&c. &c.

NEVER was a more sublime oracle delivered in any assembly, than that which I have chosen for a motto; and it is truly surprising, how a body of enlightened persons, receiving a sentiment with the enthusiastic approbation that this was received with, could, within one hour after its delivery, admit a string of propositions tending to destroy its entire effect. The impolicy of all former enactments, constituting our system of Poor Laws, is now acknowledged so generally, that there can be no necessity for insisting upon it in this place; but the sanctity of antiquity being so far violated, the profanation will be very little extended, by questioning the policy of supplying its place by any other system.

The doctrine of my motto is, LET THE PEOPLE ALONE : now this would be to adopt a new course ; and the evils already acknowledged, and complained of by Mr. Whitbread, proves that it is a *new course* that must be pursued ; but it appears to have escaped the notice of the honourable Member, that these mischiefs arose out of *legislative regulations* ; and that to continue the practice of legislative interference, is to follow the course of those who have effected all the mischief.

I will not do Mr. Whitbread the injustice to suppose, that he delivered any thing like the indigested farrago that the Reporters have attributed to him as his Speech ; but, as it would be unreasonable to imagine, that they have perverted him altogether, I must reason upon the supposition that they have preserved, at least, the spirit of his design. The Morning Chronicle makes him to have said, “ that Mr. Rose “ had considered what would be our situation if the “ Poor Laws did not exist ;” and, though it appears upon the face of the Speech that this was a mere unmeaning observation, of no more use to the argument of the honourable Member than any one of the Delphic oracles would have been, as, he neither admitted nor dissented from the propriety of Mr. Rose’s opinion, yet, from other parts of the Speech, it seems that Mr. Whitbread thinks, with that gentleman, that there is not any thing like liberality and

benevolence enough in the country, to supply sufficient funds for reducing the sum of human misery and vice, and increasing the sum of happiness and morality, without their being whipped on by an act of Parliament. I have already endeavoured to answer this objection, in my Letter to Mr. Rose*, (of which Mr. Whitbread has a copy in his possession,) and the substance of which is, that the sums raised by voluntary charity, even under the discouraging circumstances of the compulsory system, ought to be taken as a pledge for incomparably larger sums, if the benevolent disposition of the people were left to its free exercise.

This important point does not appear to have been taken into consideration by the honourable gentleman, and yet he assumes, that he "shall have the good wishes of every one for his success" in perpetuating the system of compulsion; merely because it is to be new modelled according to his fashion. For my own part, I cannot help thinking that the good wishes of the country would follow him in much greater abundance, if with a very little variation from the language of my motto, he were to say,

* See "Outline of a Plan for reducing the Poor's Rate, and amending the Condition of the Aged and Unfortunate; including those of the Naval and Military Departments: in a Letter to the Right Honourable George Rose; occasioned by his "Observations on the Poor Laws, &c." By John Buss, London, 1805.

“ I do not wish to interfere with the liberality of the people.—I do not wish to deprive them of the right of selecting the proper objects of their benevolence, of their kindness, of their care ; we have been long enough trying to manufacture happiness by act of Parliament ; and, behold, it is only vice and misery that we have produced.—We expected that our enactments would have redounded ‘ to our glory and honour ;’ but, ‘ behold, they have become our shame and reproach ! Let us try, then, whether the people may not be better instructed in the details of the subject than we are ; and whether their benevolent disposition, if left to its own spontaneous exercise, will not be fully adequate to all the purposes of national prosperity and happiness.”

Nothing can be more fair and candid than the basis laid down by Mr. Whitbread for the consideration of his proposal, which is, to examine “ what was the state of this country before the Poor Laws were enacted ;” but then it is indispensably necessary to consider the subject with reference to all the circumstances that influenced those times, or else we shall be satisfied with the mere school boy conclusion—that because they adopted a compulsory system, we must adopt one also : whereas, it is obvious that such a change has taken place in the moral and political condition of the people, that there is scarcely any feeling in common between the savages of those

times, and the imperfectly instructed populace of the present improved age. Neither the rich, nor the poor of the present day are so sordid as they were then; and it is worth while to inquire, whether the spirit of envy and suspicion, with which they regard each other, is not caused by the unnatural interference of Parliament, which refuses to leave them to the free exercise of their own generosity.

In recurring to those early times, it is impossible that an assembly so humane and equitable as that which received the sentimental and benevolent parts of Mr. Whitbread's Speech, with the most unrestrained marks of feeling and approbation, can avoid noticing the injustice and harshness with which the people were treated by the government of that time. It is acknowledged, that the system of the Poor Laws was adopted to correct the disorders that the feudal system had left behind it; and, I presume, that there is no man of common honesty, in the present day, much less any enlightened statesman, who will say, in plain words, that the Government of England ought to regard the people as yet only in the next stage from vassallage and slavery: but, if the legislature should attempt to adopt a new system, grounded upon such reasons, it would make the declaration in fact, though not in word.

There can be no objection to ranking the projectors of this system among "the wisest and most

profound philosophers that ever existed," if it be only meant, that they did the best they could according to the circumstances in which they were placed ; but if our acknowledgment of their wisdom, would be understood as a pledge of submission to any similar plan, the people of England will sedulously avoid being betrayed into such a concession.

The Reporters have given no part of Mr. Whitbread's view of the condition of the country before the Poor Laws were enacted, unless a few detached libels upon the lower order of the people, can be supposed to have formed a part of his Speech ; and therefore the public has no fair opportunity of knowing in what respect the honourable gentleman's view of the people, differs from that of the execrable tyrants of feudal times, who first reduced them to slavery and vagabondage, and then punished them for begging.

It will not be asserted that there are many persons, in any rank of life, capable of deciding upon the merits of the Poor Laws at this time, from their own knowledge ; and, being unacquainted with the subject, it is not surprizing that numbers of persons should be found inattentively and ignorantly assenting to the proposition, that the system of Poor Laws originated in the Christian principle, of *Do unto others, as you would wish they should do unto you* ; but persons who have paid any attention whatever to

the history of those times will regard it as a mere figure of speech—a flourish, to help the orator out with his period. The condition of the people was, as stated by the honourable gentleman, that of being reduced to beggary, and “forcing alms;” and, as he well observes, “the only remedy for these evils, then understood, was, greater cruelty in the enactments.” Some very striking examples of this temper are given, as quoted by Mr. Whitbread from the Statute Books; but, as they were passed at remote periods, I think the temper in which the System of Poor Laws *originated*, may be better shewn by citing an act, passed in the same reign.

The statute, of the 14 Eliz. c. 5. enacts, “That all rogues, vagabonds, and sturdy beggars, shall, upon their apprehension, be brought before a justice, and by him be committed to the common gaol until the next sessions or the next assizes; at which sessions or assizes, if such person be duly convicted of his roguish or vagabond trade of life, he shall be grievously whipped, and burnt through the gristle of the right ear with a hot iron, of the compass of an inch about; unless some person will take him into his service for a year, and enter into recognizance to keep him the year, and bring him to the sessions at the year’s end. For the second offence, being of the age of 18 years or above, he shall be adjudged a felon, unless some person will take him for two years in like manner. And

for the third offence, he shall be adjudged guilty of felony without benefit of clergy."

No person will be found hardy enough to contend for the Christian-like kindness and benevolence of this act; and if it be admitted that it was dictated by cruelty, and was designed as a punishment, I should wish to know, what signs its framers ever gave of repentance, which authorises any person to suppose, that, to the last hour of their lives, they regarded poverty otherwise than as a crime, and provided punishments for it accordingly? Before those persons, or their system, should be complimented for their Christian benevolence, it would reflect some credit to their panegyrists, if they would attempt to prove that they had been just; for upon the face of the transaction it appears, that the people have been, during the whole period, the innocent victims to the crimes, and the follies, of the government.

In tracing the misery of the people up "to the dissolution of the feudal system," one is naturally led to ask, what part they acted either in its formation or dissolution; and the answer is—Nothing; or, just as much as the cattle upon their hills, and the sheep upon their commons. They were herded, disposed of, and abandoned, as the wants or caprices of their owners directed; and if they were incapable of maintaining themselves, it was because the cruelty

and injustice of the law, refused to allow them the free exercise of their talents, and the just value of their labour.

The operating causes of the misery of the people are perfectly obvious and simple. It had been the practice of the feudal lords to retain in their service, beside their tenants and persons employed for useful purposes, thousands of others, whose only qualification, and whose only business, was—to cut throats, whenever their turbulent chiefs thought proper to make war upon their neighbours. Such a practice necessarily prevented a great mass of the population from improving with the state of society; and it was no fault of the people that they were incapable of gaining an honest livelihood. Towards the end of Henry the Seventh's reign, the trade of bloodshed was no longer followed by the Barons, and they had no further occasion for their fighting men, much less for their offspring; a vast body of the people of England were, therefore, reduced to the wretched condition of turning out naked and forlorn from the castles of those who had brought them up in dependence, to find means of subsistence, without previous instruction in the arts and manners of any class but their own. To this unfortunate tribe was added, that numerous, and equally to be pitied, description of persons, who, in the succeeding

reigns, were let loose upon the world by the dissolution of the monastic system: and who, having been prevented by the follies and prejudices of the national habits and customs, from being prepared for the new crisis, were also reduced to the condition of beggars and vagabonds.

Neither of these descriptions of persons were, in any way whatever, to blame for the new circumstances in which they were placed: they performed all the services that the law had demanded of them, as long as the law would receive them; and it was the injustice of the sovereigns, and their parliaments, in not realizing the expectations which their own laws had excited, that covered the country with swarms of vagrants. It is true, that the royal grants diminished the evils below the point at which they would have arrived, had they not been so interrupted; but those grants were never made with a view to stop the progress of wretchedness among the people, but for the purposes of either rewarding the particular favourite on whom they were bestowed, or of gratifying some resentment. As to the helpless people, *upon whom neither of those passions operated*, the whole amount of "the Christian principle" that was exerted to enable them *to provide for themselves*, consisted in allowing the justices to grant licences to beg, to such as they thought entitled to that favour; the rest were, sometimes, tempted to

follow occupations, which the wicked and abominable mercies of the governments of those times, afterwards, whipped and punished them for following. This was the unfortunate situation, particularly of "fencers, min-strels, players of interludes, &c." who were allowed to be kept by the peers of the realm; but who, if they happened to be discharged from the service of their lords, were not allowed to practice their art to get their own living.

It may not be uninteresting to cite a part of the statute of the 39th of Eliz. c. 4. to illustrate this subject: "And it is enacted, that all persons, calling themselves scholars, going about begging; all seafaring men, pretending losses of their ships or goods on the sea, going about the country begging; all idle persons going about either begging or using any subtil craft or unlawful games and plays, or feigning themselves to have knowledge in phisiognomic, palm-estrie, or other like crafty science, or pretending that they can tell destinies, fortunes, or such other like fantastical imaginations; all persons that be, or utter themselves to be, proctors, procurers, patent gatherers, or collectors for gaols, prisons, or hospitals; all fencers, bearwards, common players of interludes, and minstrels, wandering abroad, (other than players of interludes belonging to any baron of this realm, or person of greater degree;) all jugglers, tinkers, pedlars, and petty chapmen, wandering abroad; all

wandering persons and common labourers, being persons able in body, using loitering, refusing to work for common wages, not having living otherwise to maintain themselves; all persons delivered out of gaols that beg for their fees, or otherwise do travel begging; all persons wandering abroad, pretending losses by fire or otherwise; and all persons, not being felons, wandering and pretending themselves to be Egyptians, or wandering in the habit, form, or attire of counterfeiting Egyptians; shall be deemed rogues, vagabonds, and sturdy beggars.

“ And every such person, upon his apprehension, shall, by order of a justice, (*or constable* assisted by advice of the minister and one other of that parish), be stripped naked from the middle upwards, and be openly *whipped* until his body be *bloody*. And shall be then sent, from parish to parish, the next streight way, to the parish where he was born, if the same may be known by his confession or otherwise: If not, then to the parish where he last dwelt by the space of one whole year: There to put himself to labour, as a true subject ought to do.

“ In order to which, he shall, after whipping as aforesaid, have a testimonial of the said justice or constable respectively, testifying that he hath been punished, and mentioning the day and place of his punishment, and the place whereunto he is limited to go, and the time in which he is limited to pass thither,

at his peril. And if he do not accomplish the order appointed by the said testimonial, then to be elsewher taken and whipped; and so often as any default shall be found in him contrary to the form of this statute, in every place to be whipped, till he be repaired to the place limited.

“And if it be not known where he was born or last dwelt, then to be sent to the parish through which he last passed *without punishment*; to be by the officers of the said village where he last past without punishment, conveyed to the house of correction or common gaol, there to be employed in work until he be placed in some service, and so to continue by the space of one year; or not being able in body, until he be placed in some almshouse in the same county or place.

“Provided also, that nothing herein shall extend to any children *under the age of seven years.*”

This act passed only four years before the statute upon which our system of *Christian charity* is founded; and, I think, if our morals have not improved more in the course of two centuries, than those of the persons who framed the acts were likely to improve, in the interval between passing the former and the latter, we deserve to be cursed with a system bearing some resemblance to the present, and to die under the inexpiable guilt of bequeathing it to our posterity!

The acknowledgment of Mr. Whitbread, that the system has “ become our shame and reproach,” entirely saves the necessity of combating the arguments of those gentlemen who contend for its justice and benignity. But, after such an admission, the honourable Gentleman may be very fairly asked, how it has happened that we have *disgraced* ourselves by *continuing* this system, if it originated in the principles of equity and religion? It has, indeed, been our shame and reproach that we have prolonged its mischiefs; but it is because the fact is directly the reverse of what the honourable Gentleman states it to be: it is, because the legislators who framed those laws were wholly regardless of the principle which enjoins us “ to do to others as we would wish others to do to us;” and because they only “ undertook to feed the hungry—to clothe the naked—to visit the afflicted, &c.” *in their own way*, lest the people should be able *to procure* comforts *for themselves* in greater abundance.

It will, I hope, be no libel upon those “ philosophers” to give them credit for having the same kind of providence and foresight as Mr. Whitbread; and, therefore, I take it for granted, that they also feared, that, after the injuries they had done to the poor, some might seize upon particular spots, and say, “ If you do not give us relief, we will assert the right of nature, and occupy part of the soil here;

it is our right to save ourselves from starvation, if we can ; and, if you do not give us food voluntarily, we will seize it by force." Now where is the Christianity of such liberality as this? Here is nothing like considering, that "*the earth is the Lord's, with all that it contains ;*" nor any hint whatever that the legislature designed to "*undo the heavy burden, and let the oppressed go free.*" Isa. lviii. 6. It is rather like the vile calculation of a company of pedlars, than the generous self-denial of an assembly of saints ; and it wears the character of an act of hostility, much more than of a charitable design. It is confounding all ideas of right and wrong to call this wicked—this abominable—this treacherous—this starving PAUPER SYSTEM a sign of benevolence. Survey it again, and again, and the most favourable appearance that it assumes is, that of a bill of indictment against the whole people, and their posterity, without attempting to charge them with the slightest shade of *moral* turpitude : for the gratuitous crime—Vagrancy, is altogether the creature of English law ; and, though the people were to be convicted, they would accuse the government with being the author of their guilt.

The people plead guilty to the charge of vagrancy ; but what will the advocates of government say to the charge of having robbed the people of their right to assess the value of their own labour, and

to dispose of it at the market where they might find the greatest demand? This is a question that never must be slurred over in a discussion of the pauper system : for, until the legislature become sufficiently dispassionate to correct the errors committed by its predecessors in this particular, all the heart-burnings and seditions, will continue to lurk in the bosom of the labourer, and all the suspicions and apprehensions in the bosoms of the proprietor and capitalist, that have hitherto kept us in a state of uneasiness and alarm, which neither the treasure, the grandeur, nor the enjoyments beyond simple mediocrity are worth.

Without entering upon the subject in this enlarged view, any kind of interference on the part of the legislature will tend to perpetuate and increase the evils so justly complained of at present; and, in order to take such a view, it is absolutely necessary to consider what was "the condition of the country" at a period long antecedent to that in which the Poor Laws were enacted. By confining his views to the state of things immediately preceding the passing the statute of the 43d of Queen Elizabeth, Mr. Whitbread has omitted the consideration which Mr. Rose, very wisely, calls the most difficult part of the subject, that of "providing labour for the people;" and I consider this omission to be particularly unfortunate, as the honourable Member

would hardly have taken a retrospect of that period without adopting the language of my motto with regard to the *labour* as well as to the *economy* of the people, or without conjuring the legislature in that respect also *to let them alone*.

I have no wish to see a British parliament disputing about "the right that every man has to be supported by the soil on which he is born:" yet I am strongly disposed to think, that there was a time when Mr. Whitbread would not have passed over this consideration so lightly, much less have been content to demand for the people of England "a place on the statute books" to entitle them to charity! The rights of nature would, indeed, be a very unprofitable discussion in "this civilized country." But does the honourable Gentleman really think, that there is no medium between a rude scramble for an equal distribution of the soil, and the "badge" to be delivered with his "refuge from misery." If such be his opinion, the public will have much reason to regret that he has profited so little by the writings of a philosopher, who was a very great favourite upon the old opposition benches—Dr. Adam Smith. That profound statist regarded *the time and exertions of the labourer, as his PROPERTY, in as full a sense, as the land and stock, is the property of their several proprietors*; and it never could have entered into

the imagination of any rational being, that a friend of Mr. Fox's would have attempted to erect a new system of Poor Laws, without taking this principle as its basis.

It would be unwarrantable, and, perhaps, iniquitous, to question the good intentions of Mr. Whitbread in bringing forward his measure ; but, in admitting his good intentions, there is much room to lament that the power of prejudice is sufficient to pervert the judgments of the most upright and discerning. It is the constant practice of all those who possess, what the English law *chooses to call*, property, to exalt the wisdom of their predecessors, by whom those laws were made ; insomuch, that the "wisdom of our ancestors" has become a sort of cant phrase, that affixes a sacred sanction to every thing that was done in former times, even though its principles may be incompatible with every human feeling. Thus it was, that, when the feudal system was dissolved, and the heritors of land received their estates unencumbered by the vassals which their fathers had been obliged to provide for, they admired the thrift which had contrived to reserve the food of a thousand mouths to its own use ; and the "wisdom of our ancestors" has been their constant song from generation to generation !

It is to the narcotic power of this impression alone, I hope, that we are to attribute Mr. Whit-

bread's silence upon the claims that the people have upon the soil ; not only for food, like the cattle employed in its cultivation, but for all the conveniencies and comforts that the improved state of society, and their aggregate labour, is capable of producing. I will not say that the *self-love* of the opulent, but I will say that their *erroneous judgments*, have led them to suppose, that the condition of the English people has improved with the soil and the government, although no demon could utter a position more false. The government has existed for the rich, and the soil has been improved for those who never contributed one hour's labour towards its culture ; but for those who have borne the burden and heat of the day, their condition has invariably been, as it now is, such as no nobleman would suffer his dog to be condemned to. Now, I do not choose to deal in assertion upon this point, as such assertions may be made for the worst of purposes : but I will tell Mr. Whitbread how he may satisfy himself upon the subject ; and I do so, because I am sure, that, before any gentleman attempts to provide parliamentary badges of disgrace for paupers, he ought to be certain that their wages are sufficient to procure them the necessaries of life. I shall not be satisfied with being told, upon this occasion, that Mr. Whitbread has made every inquiry that he thinks necessary upon the subject : I say, he has not made any thing like the inquiries that he ought to

have made, if he has not been to Deptford Dockyard, and inquired, whether it is possible that the *labourers* can, by any contrivance of human wisdom or economy, live either decently or honestly upon the pay that they are allowed ; and if they, and many thousands of the hard-drudged English, are only rewarded with offals and rags, let him ask his conscience, where is the religion, where is the philosophy, that can reflect upon the system without abhorrence ?

There is one observation of the honourable Gentleman's which I heartily applaud : " That the poor have acquired a facility of procuring a much greater degree of comfort for their small sums, by laying them out themselves, than they could possibly obtain if the rich were to take the trouble of laying out the same sums for them." I thank him for his design in making the remark, which was, to urge the legislature to leave the people as much as possible to themselves ; yet I do think it possible that inattentive persons may draw some very unwarrantable conclusions from the fact. It is true that the Poor have contrivances by which they make very small sums answer their purposes, which contrivances are wholly unknown to the other classes : but there is a point beyond which no human ingenuity can stretch itself ; and that is, to procure any given quantity of the necessaries of life, for a less sum than their market

value. To illustrate this position, and to aid any inquisitive mind that may be disposed to inquire into the situation of the labourers in Deptford Dockyard, the Post Office, the India House, or other places where great numbers of European slaves are employed, I will just give a sketch of the economy of a person in one of those employments, as I received it from his own artless statement.

A young man, seeing an office opened as an "ECONOMICAL BANK," in Albion Street, Blackfriars Bridge, which offered to assist the industrious and frugal in making provision for age, came in to ask what annuity a few shillings, annually paid, from the age of 24, would provide him with from the age of 56; and the question led to some inquiries from me, of which the following is the result: He said that he worked from six o'clock in the morning till six o'clock at night, and received sixteen shillings per week wages, and had been so employed one year. I endeavoured to preach economy to him, upon the ground stated in every thing that I have written upon the subject; namely, that "youth is the season when money can be better spared than at more advanced periods." It was not without some surprise that I found him so perfectly systematic, as to be ready to assure me, that, though he is wholly unencumbered, his wages, apparently ample for a single man, were scarcely sufficient to keep him in life and health,

even with the most rigid care. His expenses were regulated as follow :

His lodging cost him two shillings and sixpence weekly, and he breakfasted upon bread and butter and milk and water, to save the expense of tea. His dinner consisted of half a pound of meat and a pint of porter; he could afford nothing to eat or drink between dinner and supper; but he supped also upon bread and butter, with the addition of a pint of porter. Amongst the items of his expense was, one shilling, paid weekly, to his landlady, for cooking for him at her fire, and in consideration of supplying him with salt and pepper, and a small quantity of soap, to wash himself with; and another item was, five pence per week for washing and mending. In addition to these regular expenses, he had purchased two coarse shirts, for seven shillings each, and two handkerchiefs, for two shillings each; two pair of worsted stockings had cost him five shillings; and five pair of shoes, at seven shillings per pair, had cost him one pound fifteen shillings; which, with the expense of mending the old ones, being seven shillings and sixpence more, amounted to two pounds two shillings and sixpence. He had not debited himself with a single farthing, for any of those nameless wants or idle extravagancies, which the poor are supposed to indulge in; and yet he had only one pound nine shillings and ten pence, remaining at

the end of the year, after paying his daily expenses. The thing appeared incredible at first sight, but he accounted for it in the most satisfactory manner. Being asked whether he had not purchased more shoes than he could require within the year, he said that his labour obliged him to be constantly upon his feet; and that the shoes he had remaining at the end of the year were not equal in value to what he had when he entered upon his employment: the article of lodging, also seemed to be charged rather higher than a person in his situation ought to expend; this he admitted to be somewhat of the character of an indulgence, as he might have had a lodging at one shilling and sixpence a week. His reason for choosing to pay one shilling per week more, was, that if he went into a room for one shilling and sixpence, instead of two shillings and sixpence, he must have had another man to live and sleep with him; and, being of a studious turn, he could not meet with any such joint inmate, that would not be an extremely disagreeable companion to him; and he added, that for his two shillings and sixpence, he was provided with a small quantity of candle, which would not be the case if he were in a joint lodging. I observed, that he did not state his expences meal by meal, but that he charged them all by the week;—bread, three shillings and threepence; milk, sevenpence; butter, one shilling and twopence;

meat, two shillings and fourpence; beer, two shillings and elevenpence; and I asked how he came to want so great an amount in bread: he answered, that as bread was his principal food, he took a larger quantity than persons do who eat vegetables and soups; and, therefore, that he could not do with less than six half quartern loaves per week; but that, considering the difference of expense for firing and cooking, if he were to take vegetables and soups, he found bread much the cheapest. Of milk he allowed himself one pennyworth for his breakfast; and he never suffered himself to eat more than two half pounds of butter in each week; so that his whole arrangement was as under:

	per Week.
Meat $\frac{1}{2}$ lb. per day, at 4d.....	2s. 4d.
Milkdo.....1d.....	0 7
Butterdo.....2d.....	1 2
Beerdo.....5d.....	2 11
Bread	3 3
Lodging, &c.	2 6
Cooking, &c.	1 0
Washing and mending	0 5

14 2

Leaving him a remainder of 1 10

16 0

Or, upon the whole year, an amount of 4 15 4

From which deduct for shoes 2 2 6

Two shirts 0 14 0

Two handkerchiefs 0 4 0

Two pair of stockings 0 5 0

3 5 6

He is left with a remainder of £ 1 9 10

This one pound nine shillings and ten pence is to supply him with cloaths, when he has worn out those that he was provided with at the time. he engaged in his situation ; but his present appearance evinces, that, before his twenty-nine shillings can be doubled, he will be reduced to a state of nudity, and probably, will be dismissed from his place, for the indecency of his garb, unless, before that time, he should sacrifice his virtuous independence, and either accept of some left-off cloaths from his superiors in employment, or be willing to run in debt, as a preferable evil. Should the latter event happen, no curse can be too bitter to be poured out upon the man, whether he be in the capacity of a legislator, or a private citizen, who may lift up his voice in favour of such an infernal system ; for no possible stretch of virtue can be practised by the best disposed heart, that this comfortless Drudge has not exerted, with a view to live honestly ; and, should he, after all, be reduced to the alternative of sacrificing either his morals or his decency, it will serve to prove, that the whole tendency of our laws is the punishment of virtue, and the encouragement of vice.

I must not forget to state, whilst examining the items of this man's expenses, that there was one which struck me as uncommonly low, and I doubt

its correctness; it was the charge of five pence weekly for washing and mending; he explained this, by saying, that he could only afford to clean himself on Sundays; and that one clean shirt cost him three pence; one pair of stockings one penny; and one handkerchief one halfpenny, the other halfpenny being all that he paid for mending. His contrivance for making one handkerchief serve him in a week, was such as none but the poorest of the poor would have thought of, and none but a criminal could be reduced to, in a country where the legislature understood its duty. He wears, he says, a pocket handkerchief round his neck during the first week, after it is clean; and when it has performed that service, he takes it to fulfil its own duty during the second week: and it is by a thousand such make-shifts, that he, and many of the honest and hard-worked people of England, continue to crawl over the soil for a few years, without ever once gasping a single breeze of pleasure, or being regarded with any greater degree of complacency than the reptiles, which crawl over it also.

I do not doubt but this minuteness will be called frivolous and paltry; yet, I cannot think that the members of either house of Parliament, or even persons more exalted, will deal fairly by their consciences, if they enter into any kind of discussion

upon the affairs of the poor without patiently listening to a vast variety of details of this sort ; and I may very fairly challenge any person interested in the reputation of government to assert its rectitude, if it gives the least countenance to Mr. Whitbread's proposal, without instituting a minute inquiry as to the sums necessary to enable the people to keep their families comfortably, and whether our present arrangements do afford them these sums. Government cannot be just so long as it neglects to consider the question in this way ; because it can be actuated by no better motive for its neglect, than a determination to continue robbing the people of their share of the improvements and ameliorations that have taken place in the state of society, by the overthrow of the feudal system, and the introduction of commerce.

It is truly astonishing, how ingeniously persons who have continued in a long course of evil, manage to keep one another in countenance, and to create for themselves a sort of complaisant conscience, that will only condemn them by the rules which they prescribe for each other ! The persons influenced by this perverted conscience, will, as they constantly do, affirm, that the condition of the people has improved with the alteration of manners ; and the very singular proof that they adduce, is, the large sums that are raised for the support of paupers, and the

immense donations that are distributed in the form of voluntary charity. But, surely, no person who ever seriously and honestly reflected upon such an argument, will suppose, that poverty is less painful for having a constant view of abundance; or, that misery is less acute in proportion to the number of comforts that it sees fleeing before it. Unless this conclusion be admitted, I cannot imagine, upon what ground the present condition of the labourer can be said to be preferable to what it was before the dissolution of the feudal system; for, to me, the difference between being obliged to work incessantly for a modicum, scarcely sufficient to keep the springs of nature in motion, and being chained to the soil, to be fed by the bounty of a master, does not appear so clear as the lovers of mere freedom seem to think it. It is said, the labourer has plenty to eat and to drink; and I say, so he always had; and I will add, that if he had not been better supplied in former times than the Young Man above treated of, he never could have divided his allowance with an offspring or a partner. But, suppose it be admitted, for argument sake, that the poverty of our labouring people arises principally out of the increased number of their wants, occasioned by the increased conveniences of the times; and that, if they would be content with the simplicity of their forefathers, their wages would be amply sufficient; will any person assert, that the

transition from the doublet to the jacket, bears any proportion to that which has taken place between the exalted style of the Duke of Norfolk, and that of his great Ancestor, who sat in privy council, at the head of his cooks, ordering mustard to be made?

Those who are interested in continuing the system of their forefathers, follow the course marked out by Archdeacon Paley:—They endeavour to persuade the people, that a double allowance of contentment will be a sufficient compensation for being put off with half an allowance of necessaries! “Of the two,” says the political Divine, “the poor are protected by the laws more than the rich: for it is the law that defends the weak against the strong—the humble against the powerful—the little against the great.” Yet he has forgotten to point out, whereabout on the statute books a single line may be found to secure either a sufficient quantity of employment for all the inhabitants who depend upon their labour for subsistence, or a recompense for those that are employed, bearing any thing like a proportion to the produce of their labour. It is well enough for those, who have all the advantages on their own side, to solve all difficulties in the flourishing state of the arts, the manufactures, and the commerce of our country; because, their comforts do increase, whilst the comforts of the labouring people diminish in exact proportion, as the

country advances in civilization. I shall not be ashamed of the plagiarism, in quoting Adam Smith upon this occasion, because I think *he* may be admitted to speak truth, without having improper motives attributed to him. He has traced out the causes of the miseries of the English labourer in such a clear and masterly manner, as proves, that any new system, to be just, must be founded upon an equitable emancipation of the people from the sudden and unnatural increase of property by the introduction of commerce, in as full a sense as that property and its owners are now emancipated from the power of the king.

The constant struggle for power between the king and the barons, under the feudal system, necessarily gave both an interest in conciliating the good-will of the people; and the bounty of the crown, when judiciously bestowed, was sufficiently powerful to counteract the turbulence and the conspiracies of the feudal lord, so long as they were obliged to superintend the fortification of their castles, and to rely upon physical strength; but when the dissolution of that system afforded them leisure to exert their senatorial power more frequently, they were able to harass and controul the king, both without the aid of the people, and in defiance of them. Thus it is that the power of the crown has been gradually weakened, till an English king can literally and truly

“do no wrong,” because, they have deprived him of the power of doing either right or wrong! The condition of the kings of England is not worse for this curtailment of authority; for, if they have not large civil armies to surround them, they are freed from the expense of them; but, certainly, that of the people is not bettered by the change; because they have lost much of their importance, without having received any equivalent.

The language that Adam Smith used, with regard to the state of things under the feudal system, may not improperly be applied to that which has since obtained; it has not weakened the hands of the great proprietors sufficiently to establish order and good government among the inhabitants of the country; “because it has not sufficiently altered that state of property and manners from which our disorders originally sprung.” Now the fault, in the ancient state of property was, that it appropriated to one man’s use the produce of another man’s labour, which gave to the proprietor of those slaves an interest in abridging their comforts as much as possible, and enabled him to extend his ambitious views in proportion as he could contrive the means of abridging comfort, so as to make a larger number of idlers subsist upon the produce of a smaller number of labourers. If, therefore, the people were at any time allowed to satisfy the

cravings of nature, it was not from any feeling of generosity, but an apprehension, that, if starved and goaded too much, they might be driven to serve themselves; or, as Mr. Whitbread has it, they might say, "We will assert the right of nature, and occupy part of the soil here: it is our right to save ourselves from starvation, if we can; and, if you do not give us food voluntarily, we will seize it by force."

These seditions were powerful means in the hands of the people, whilst both the king and the lords continued to want their services; and, though such a state of society was dreadful, beyond the power of words to express, the evils were nearly equally divided among the different classes. It was extremely different when the overthrow of the feudal, and the introduction of the commercial system, enabled the proprietor to say to the labourer, "Work for me, upon my terms, or I will send you out a vagabond, to be exposed to all the whippings, the burnings, and the imprisonments, that I, and my colleagues, can contrive, to reduce you to our terms." "Foreign commerce and manufactures," continues Dr. Adam Smith, "gradually furnished the great proprietors with something, for which they could exchange the whole surplus produce of their lands, and which they could consume themselves, without sharing it with tenants and retainers. All for ourselves, and nothing for other people, seems, in every

age of the world, to have been the vile maxim of the masters of mankind. As soon, therefore, as they could find a method of consuming the whole value of their rents themselves, they had no disposition to share them with any other person; for a pair of diamond buckles, perhaps, or for something as frivolous and useless, they exchanged the maintenance, or what is the same thing, the price of the maintenance, of a thousand men for a year." The riches and grandeur of those who possessed stock, now increased prodigiously, but labour became wholly and entirely at their mercy; and thus the people have become reduced to the necessity of working beyond their strength, and of receiving their wages rather as a boon than a right.

Another cogent reason why this subject should be considered, with reference to the condition of the people long antecedent to the enactment of the Poor Laws, is, the necessity of inquiring, what effect the exclusive charters and corporations have had upon the affairs of the people, and whether there be any motive of policy or justice for continuing them.

It was the practice of the English monarchs to grant exclusive privileges to cities, towns, and trading companies, long before the necessity of our system of Poor Laws existed; and the wisdom of those concessions is evident from their being exactly suited

to the state of the times in which they were made ; but the whole of the circumstances being altered, at the time when the business of act of parliament charity began, a proper attention to their duty, would have led the senators of the 43d of Elizabeth, to have inquired whether those charters, and exclusive privileges, had not accomplished all the good of which they were capable.

When the exclusive privilege were first granted, they were founded on the mutual interests of the king, the landlord, and the people, and were resorted to in no other character than as a remedy for the diseases of the feudal system. The landlords found, that, in the shortest intervals of peace, the population increased upon their estates at once, beyond the demands of their military establishments, and the attention that they were willing to bestow on the improvement of their lands : this surplus population, therefore, became an encumbrance, hat they were desirous of getting removed ; and hence they encouraged the formation of towns, and also their people to reside in them. It was fortunate for the people, that the monarchs were as anxious to collect them together, as the landlords were to get rid of them, for the youth of both sexes were sure of finding reception and employment under the king's privileges, as they grew burdensome to the estates, The motive of the sovereigns for wishing to bring

the people together in towns was, to raise for themselves a power to oppose the landed proprietors. "Hence," says Adam Smith, "the princes, who lived upon the worst terms with their barons, made the most liberal grants to their burghs."

Now this practice, so long as the motives existed which gave rise to it, was attended with the most salutary effects, for it served to create a new species of property, which, whilst it gradually diminished the inordinate power of the barons, gradually raised the commons into *sufficient* consequence to reconcile the other orders of the state; but this result had not been foreseen by either of the other estates in the commencement. No objection could be made to the granting exclusive privileges, in the first instance, to the persons so incorporated, because they were entering into a new kind of life, which was not merely subject to all the casualties of ignorance and mistake, that new concerns are always exposed to, but to the particular inconveniences of those times; which were, that the cities and towns were objects of jealousy to the warlike chiefs in proportion as they became prosperous, and, therefore, were constantly liable to be attacked and pillaged. Allurements more powerful than mere meat and drink were necessary to induce people to encounter those dangers, and it became requisite to extend their privileges to their heirs, to indemnify them for the expenses that

they necessarily incurred in fortifying and defending their towns, and defraying such other expenses as were peculiarly their own. Such privileges were indeed extended in later times, for less laudable motives, but the fines levied, and repeatedly levied, upon all those bodies, as the calls of the state or the cupidity of the princes required money, served to repeat the original understanding, that these privileges were resumable whenever the convenience of the country might require it.

Those corporate bodies, and the persons who compose them, have increased in power and wealth in a greater proportion than any description of persons in the country, and ages have elapsed since they began to think that the rest of the nation lived for them, and not they for the nation. Their privileges they have, invariably, exercised in the most ungenerous manner, and what was originally intended as a remedy, has, by being continued too long in use, become itself a source of disease, which has debilitated and consumed the body politic to a degree of feebleness, that has induced the state physicians to condemn it to pine itself away in solitude*.

* Mr. Malthus has written 1064 pages to prove, that we must no longer obey the divine command, "Be fruitful and multiply," according to the sense that we have hitherto affixed to that passage; and Mr. Whitbread considers the principles of that writer "to be founded in nature, and incapable of being overturned."

To detail any of the effects of the corporation laws either of the different cities, towns, or companies, or of the laws of settlements, or laws for the encouragement of long apprenticeships, would be trifling, they have been so fully and so ably treated of by the learned Writer, so frequently mentioned, that little of what is new can be added. It is at least thirty years since every rational being, except the sordid members of those unhallowed combinations have panted for their dissolution; and the Foxites of the last twenty years have received much more credit than their due, if it was not a part of their system, in 1783, to absorb those privileges for the general interests of the nation. At all events, "chartered rights" was the watch-word, by which their opposers were rallied and marshalled against them; and Mr. Whitbread, now the greatest favourite of that party, will not greatly increase his popularity, if he cannot urge the impropriety of the *uti possidetis*, at least as zealously in this case, as when he lately called upon his country to sacrifice the principle to oblige her enemies! The honourable Gentleman may call himself "a Reformer;" he may go the length of his friend, Mr. Fox, and conjure the people to meet, and to continue their meetings, for the purpose of obtaining reform; but, if he wishes the corporation system to be regarded in any other way, than as a mere fungus that has arisen

out of the disorders of the English constitution, his declarations will degenerate into idle talk, that will lose even the power of amusing.

Those who regard these monopolies as part of the system that forms the cement between man and man, will start from the consideration of this subject, because, it involves in it the question of parliamentary reform, and would alter the tenure of every seat in the House of Commons. This, I shall be told, is not a proper time to attempt a parliamentary reform, because the people are too brutal to appreciate the value of the elective franchise; and, as I do not mean to dispute this point, I ask, why any gentleman should take advantage of their ignorance to attempt imposing upon them with his Charity Badge, whilst they are incapable of entering into the consequences and details connected with it? I know that the mass of the people are little better than brutes; I know, that they may *truly* be characterized as a "swinish multitude;" I know, that a great part of them barter away their comforts for porter and spirits; and that, a still greater part of them have not courage enough to maintain any single truth, until they have examined whether it accords with the opinions of their respective parties:—I do not wish to attach to me, so many of this herd as could be packed in a sugar-hogshead, if I could only purchase them by acknowledging that they are fitted for par-

liamentary reform at this time : but I contend, that their incapacity ought to excuse them from any alteration that would confirm the growing evils of two centuries, until pains shall have been taken to inform their judgments, and convince them of its propriety.

It is but lately, that, in the language of Mr. Whitbread, the higher classes have discovered that our present system of Poor Laws have become our “shame and reproach;” and, surely, if they have been two hundred years in discovering the simple fact, “that a system is not perfect whose principles are radically wrong,” it is too much to expect that even they should be immediately provided with the precise improvements, that shall render it more suitable for the two succeeding centuries ! and this may render a little more experience necessary to the higher, as well as the lower classes, before any legislative steps shall be taken, which must, for ever, prevent the emancipation of the people.

It is particularly favourable for a full and candid discussion of this whole subject, that the present Parliament have evinced a disposition, for which its predecessors cannot obtain credit,—a disinclination to legislate unnecessarily for posterity. This honourable spirit has been equally evinced by both sides of the House ; and it has already done more to destroy the superstitious regard for “the wis

dom of our ancestors," than all the mischiefs of their Corporation Laws, and Poor Laws, and Laws of Settlements, have been able to affect since they were first enacted. The very patriotic and judicious observations of Mr. Henry Thornton, upon the negligence of our ancestors, with regard to the finances, strictly applies to the corporations and charters of all kinds: they arose out of the rude state of society then existing; and it could never have been intended by the lawgivers of those times, to bind their posterity to a system for several hundred years after the circumstances had departed from which it was derived. The truth, is, that legislators, like individuals, are very frequently led to be satisfied with expedients upon pressing occasions, in hopes that experience and leisure may direct them to proper measures; and it would be singular indeed, if our ancestors had never been driven to this necessity, even in their most important concerns; when almost the whole series of time, from the earliest of our records, until the last hand was put to our pauper system, was occupied in the most violent struggles of foreign and domestic warfare.

We smile at the singular species of egotism, held up to ridicule in Holy Writ, by the Parable which represents the Bramble calling upon all the lofty trees of the forest, to put themselves under his shadow, and anoint him king over them; yet, the

presumption of our ancestors would not have been less, if they had commanded us to shape all the arrangements of our refined and peaceful age, to the ignorance of their rude and tumultuous times; and our folly is infinitely greater, for acting in conformity to such a proposition, without the authority of such a sanction.

There is, perhaps, no better way of shewing respect for our ancestors, than by consulting our own feelings with regard to posterity; and of treating the regulations of our fathers, as we would be willing to let our successors treat the regulations of our own age. Would there, in this event, be more than one gentleman in ten, out of those who most piously devote themselves to antiquity, that would prescribe the rules by which his grandchildren should be governed, and interdict them from exercising their judgments, upon cases that might not arise till long after death should disable him from aiding them with his advice? I think not: and, if I am right, would it not tend to arouse the energies of our youthful senators, and direct their attention to the wants of the times, if we were to adopt the sublime apophthegm of Mr. Burke, and to determine upon all occasions, that, "it would be unjustifiable to go back to the records of other times, to instruct us how to manage what they never enabled us to foresee?" Now there would be nothing dangerous

In carrying this doctrine of Mr. Burke into practice; for, except the term Revolution, which every great alteration is liable to be designated by, a great deal of misery would be converted into a great deal of happiness, and those who already possess happiness, would find it greatly increase, when they saw that the comforts of those around them did not diminish their own.

But I must take care, when I begin to talk of the happiness and comfort of the people, that I do not forget Mr. Malthus and Mr. Whitbread. The Morning Chronicle has made the latter gentleman to say, that, "Every one must join in the benevolent wish of Henry the Fourth of France; that he would be glad to see the time, when every peasant in his dominions could afford to have a pullet in his pot, every day, for dinner; but that the thing was impossible; and we ought carefully to avoid the holding out of false notions, which God and nature do not permit us to realise." As I cannot imagine that this "pullet," is to be taken in any other than a figurative sense, I do not know how I am to understand the passage, if it does not mean, that the soil of the country is incapable of providing food for its inhabitants. I think it must be so construed, notwithstanding a preceding position in the honourable Gentleman's Speech; that "Man is born to labour as the sparks fly upward;" for, al-

though I know that man is born to labour, and to “trouble” too, as the sparks fly upward—that, whilst labouring, he may enjoy the fruits of his labour—that he may be followed by troubles, of innumerable kinds, and not be able to reckon poverty in all the catalogue ; yet, it appears to me, that the object of Mr. Whitbread’s reasoning, was, to prove the enthusiasm and folly of all attempts to prevent the poverty and distresses of the people. I am sure I would not put this construction upon the passage, if I could think it capable of bearing any other ; but I cannot conceive any possible necessity that Mr. Whitbread could feel himself under, to convince the House of Commons of the self-evident fact—that persons, possessing no other property, must, indispensably, live by their labour. I am, therefore, obliged to suppose that the Speech is very loosely reported, and that the honourable Gentleman’s opinion coincides with that of Mr. Malthus, as to the incompetency of nature to supply the wants of the people.

If such were the state of things, at which we were now arrived, it would be of little consequence whether the Parliament were reformed, the Corporations abolished, or the Poor Laws amended ; for we should, in spite of every virtuous and generous lesson, become a sly, hypocritical, selfish, set of wretches, as greedy as any charter-monger of the vilest craft, and as miserable as envy and despair could make us.

Every one for himself, would then be justified by circumstances; and every act of generosity, every personal sacrifice for the good of individuals, or the public, would deserve to be, and would be punished, by producing, in all cases, a degree of evil proportioned to what it intended to remove. We should see disappointment in every act, and an enemy in every face; we should be reduced in a less apparent, and less violent degree, to a situation, in nature precisely similar to the late unfortunate struggle, between a crowd, in a confined space;—our wants would press us so hard, that every consideration would give way to our self love; and the death of a friend (if it were possible that friendship could exist under such circumstances) would console us with the prospect of being benefited by his absence.

If we are only entering upon this crisis, what wise or good motive can lead any person to suggest improvements? the rich would not attempt it with any other view, than to continue the comfort of their own families, longer than it would continue, if things were to flow in the old channel: were they to act from any better motive, they would deserve to be branded as unnatural monsters. By improvements, therefore, they would mean, the welfare of their own particular families; and the poor, when the earth no longer yielded to their labour, could never suggest any measure, under the guise of im-

provement, whose object would not be, to gain by art what nature had refused to industry. Where is the driveller that would talk of Providence under such a state of things? it would be blasphemy towards God, and mockery towards man! What is Providence, if it comes unprepared for the propensities of nature? If the people have only escaped from the struggle between barons and kings, to be tortured in a conflict between Nature and Providence, why stigmatize them with Badges? Ought they not, rather, to be pitied, as the creatures of necessity? But why do I dwell upon the gloomy notion! Every fact, and every combination of facts, proves, that our measures do not arise out of such a conflict, but out of the injudicious policy of government.

If Mr. Whitbread, in disclaiming all wild and enthusiastic *projects* for *doing* away poverty altogether, only means to say, that, without possessing the requisite talents to perform any of the useful occupations or services of life,—without a proper and diligent application of those talents, if possessed;—or without an economical appropriation of the fruit of those talents, if properly and diligently applied, people, must necessarily, be poorer than those who are oppositely circumstanced, he will, doubtless, find every human being, who ever thought upon the subject, exactly of the same opinion. But this, again, would be a mere truism, which I can hardly suppose

that he would find it necessary to utter in the House of Commons; and I am, from this observation, also obliged to suppose, that he regards poverty as arising out of moral and physical necessity, and not out of our political errors. I cannot doubt but that the honourable Gentleman has very good reasons for his opinion, though, according to the report of his Speech, he did not assign any; yet, I cannot imagine any reason half so good, as what an Old Lady once gave, for charging me with wickedness and presumption, in attempting to prove, that the people might be cured of poverty: “God Almighty, she said, “*had made both rich and poor;*” and it was in vain I endeavoured to convince her that the Scriptures only meant, that all were equally the creatures of the same benevolent Being, whether they might enjoy riches, or suffer poverty. “Riches and poverty,” she aptly replied, “were equally God’s creatures, and he disposed of them as best suited his divine purposes.” Such reasoning is sure to work its way, and I have not seen anything stronger in Mr. Malthus’s Work; but, I must acknowledge, that it did not take a very great effect upon my mind, for the pious Matron resented the attempts to eradicate the Small-pox, as equally presumptuous and wicked; and, by a trifling perversion of Scripture, justified her argument as well,—for she contended, that there could be no “*evil in a city*

if the Lord had done it:—as it was “*he who had created the waster to destroy:*” I stand in no awe of any denunciation on this latter account; for I think, that if it be possible to trace the Divine approbation in any of our measures, that approbation may be seen in the success that has attended our endeavours to eradicate this noisome disorder; and if the Divine blessing has assisted us, in suppressing, so effectually, a subtle and inveterate disease of the animal system, I think there is fair ground to hope, that the same Divine blessing would attend the same degree of exertion and benevolence, that would undertake to cure the most subtle and inveterate disease of the political system—Poverty!

For those who suppose they are wholly uninfluenced by the reasons of the Old Lady, in their belief of the necessary existence of poverty, I think a scriptural reproof may be found also: *Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of*, they may be told, for the principle has grown up with the pauper system; and a child has scarcely ever been able to learn the distinctions between rich and poor, before he has been taught, that God had “predestinated all these things, from before the foundation of the world.”

It is particularly unfortunate for the people of England, that a scheme, which influences all their manners and concerns in life, to the extent that the Poor Laws do, should have originated at the pe-

ried that it did ; for, instead of those philosophers, (as Mr. Whitbread calls the persons who framed the Poor Laws) taking the evidence of their own senses for the rule of their conduct, they made a merit of being guided, by what they fancied to be—the Divine will. It will be recollected, that the Thirty-nine Articles, and the Pauper System, were cast in the same mould ; and let every reasonable being ask himself, whether the sovereigns, the lords, the bishops, or the senators, who were anxious to prove that God had made the majority of his creatures, for the sole purpose of consigning them to endless damnation, would be peculiarly solicitous about finding the best means of saving them from temporal starvation !

It would be a waste of words, and a loss of time, to answer what Mr. Malthus has written upon the subject : the variety of considerations that he has connected with it, and the voluminous answers that it has already called, and, probably, will yet call forth, all tend to involve it in unusual complexity, and to prevent the most laborious from advancing towards a conclusion. But no such fatiguing research is necessary : for there are a few simple considerations, which every peer, and every member of parliament, however he may be occupied, can find leisure to satisfy himself upon, and which will enable him to enter upon the discussion with much more clearness

than if he suffers himself to be entangled in a vast maze of collateral argument.

One obvious and natural question arises out of the increasing poverty, which has followed the people from the commencement of the pauper system until the last returns, when the number of paupers amounted to nearly one-eighth of the whole population; and that question is,—Did the legislature, at any time between the reign of Queen Elizabeth and the Revolution, make provision for as great a number of people as the soil would maintain, seeing that upwards of two millions of acres have been inclosed since that period? Sir William Petty supposes that the population amounted to five millions and a half at the time of Queen Elizabeth; and, though his data is not very satisfactory, it may very safely be admitted that he did not differ widely from the truth. If, then, we, with a population of 8,872,980, can contrive to keep 7,833,264 without charity, and 1,039,264 poor persons upon the labour of the rest, could they not have kept 7,000,000 of people during the whole period, if they had taken measures to improve the agricultural state of the country to the extent that it now is? I do not choose to embarrass the inquiry, by following all the writers who have hazarded conjectures as to the state of the population, agriculture, manufactures, and com-

source, at the several different periods between the reign of Elizabeth and this time: so little care has been taken to preserve many of the facts that are essential to the formation of a just opinion, that, after the most diligent research, every inquirer will be greatly misled, if he suffers himself to follow any other guide than his own plain common sense, in deciding what ought to be done, under present circumstances. For my own part, I take the argument of common sense to be, that if 39, 027, 156 acres of cultivated land would, in 1801, yield a maintenance for 7,833,264 persons, without charity, any smaller number could have been maintained without charity, during the whole of the two preceding centuries, if the governments of those times had taken care to improve their lands in proportion to the increase of their population. Supposing this reasoning to be true, it will follow, that the poverty and wretchedness that has prevailed, previous to the present amount of our population, has not been occasioned by the limited powers of nature, but by the negligence of those, who call themselves the fathers, and ought to be the purveyors, of the people.

It is not foreign to this mode of arguing to inquire, whether the indolence of preceding governments, may now still operate upon the conduct of our own; and, though more improvements have taken place within the last twenty years than at any former pe-

riod, it may not be impossible, that still further progress might, and ought, to have been made.

According to the best accounts, there are yet upwards of 7,000,000 of acres uncultivated, in England alone; and, according to the proportion that the present population bears to the lands in a state of cultivation, if these wastes were improved, they would admit of the population being increased to nearly the amount of 1,600,000 more, before we need to look out for any other resource. It is, therefore, evidently unnecessary to begin, thus early, to sacrifice the generous passions of nature; and, if it be unnecessary, the government cannot act upon the principle, without being guilty of cruelty towards those who become its victims. Now, if the whole cultivated, and improvable, soil of England is capable of feeding (for the sake of an even number) a population of ten millions and a half, there never would have been a single pauper, if the governments had done their duty; and there will be a *diminution* in the number of paupers, until the population amounts to ten millions and a half, if succeeding governments do their duty. I say, a *diminution*, because the present government ought not to bear the sins of their ancestors, and it must not be forgotten, that the paupers of the present age are not made paupers by the state of things that at present exist, but by a state of things that has now

passed away. This age is borne down by that which preceded it, as that was borne down by the age before; so that we cannot argue any deficiency in the resources of our own age from the increased amount of our Poor's Rate, the major part of the paupers living upon that rate, having been made poor by the former state of things. When we pay five millions annually towards the Poor's Rate, we are not paying for anything that may be called our own, we are paying the drafts that our ancestors have drawn upon us, and are bearing a burden that they ought to have borne themselves; and though these five millions are drawn from the supply of the present age, and create poverty to that amount, yet, if our resources be improved to the extent of which they are capable, we shall be able to satisfy the claims of our predecessors without drawing countervailing drafts upon our posterity.

The principal improvements in our lands began in the year 1733, but the major part of them since 1793, and the claims that are now making upon the pauper funds are, I think, principally, those that took their rise in the state of things before the former period. I think also, that very few claims have been made that may be ascribed to the state of things since 1793; and I am persuaded, that, with very little trouble, we may prevent our pauper system being continually beyond the period when all the

claims shall have been made upon it, that existed prior to the year 1798.

A cold, unfeeling politician, would determine the propriety of abandoning the pauper system by considering, whether a larger quantity of food would not be annually taken from the common stock, if the people were all ~~also~~ to gratify the cravings of their own appetites, than if a great number of them be kept in a condition that must limit their consumption, by subjecting their appetites to charitable allowance. I am not sure, that this opinion has not had its share in preserving the pauper system; but I am sure, that its impolicy will be strikingly apparent, if it be considered, how insignificant the difference is, between the quantity of food necessary to preserve life; and what would be sufficient to satisfy the inclination. For, as every pauper consumes a quantity of food sufficient to preserve life, the difference between the demands of his health, and the demands of his inclinations, is all that the common stock gains by him; and, against this gain is to be reckoned, the loss it suffers, by being deprived of the produce that his exertions would add to it, if he were left in a condition, to increase it; by the productive power of his labour.

In objection to this proposition, it is said, that to increase the stock, would be to reduce the price, and that then the farmer would not be able to pay

his expenses; this opinion is sanctioned by such respectable authorities, and supported by such, seemingly, powerful reasons, that a person can hardly attempt to controvert it, without being charged with presumption; yet, with all due deference and respect to the high and learned persons who are governed by this opinion, I think there is one reason, that I always hear it supported by, which carries conviction with it, that this inability of the farmer does not arise out of the nature of things, but out of our own unhappy policy. The reason so universally given, is, that, "when grain becomes below a certain price, the farmer can make more of his money by laying it out in the funds, than he can make of it by agriculture;" and, therefore, the mode we take to induce him to employ his capital in the cultivation of his lands is, to keep up the price of grain, by allowing it to be exported, when the price becomes reduced below what the farmer considers equivalent to the value of money in the public funds. Now this appears, to me, to be one of the most fatal errors that our government has committed, for it might evidently have attained its end as well, without suffering any exportation whatever; and, certainly, if there can be the least ground for even reasoning upon the necessity of condemning our youth to monkish solitude, upon the principle of our food being insufficient to supply their legiti-

mate offspring, every motive of virtue and honour calls upon us to reject the principle of exportation, in whatever form it may be proposed to us.

The choice of the farmer would be determined in favour of cultivation, as well by a fall in the interest of money, as by a rise in the price of the productions of the earth; and I am convinced, that if the legislature could be prevailed upon to sacrifice the prejudices that have been raised in favour of the monied interest, during the last century, and reduce the interest of money, upon every appearance of scarcity, that the country would then possess the secret by which all its wants would be invariably supplied. I am, also persuaded, that this is the only way by which property can be rendered conducive, at all times, to the general happiness; but, as I do not know that I could say any thing new to this effect, I beg leave to refer the Reader to a Work which every statesman must read, before he is qualified to vote upon any subject connected with political economy: I mean "THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS," written by GEORGE CRAUFURD, Esq. of ROTTERDAM, and published by Messrs. Payne and Mc'Kinlay, in the Strand, London. Should this course be objected to, because it would derange our financial system, as now established, the same objection will do as well for every other improvement that may be suggested; and, particularly, to the

alterations in the Poor Laws, as recommended by Mr. Whitbread.

All the interests of the country have long been sacrificed to the monied interest, and those sacrifices have contributed to the mischiefs arising out of the pauper system; but, the consequences were not foreseen when these arrangements were first made, otherwise the monied men would have been contented, in all cases, with more moderate terms; and government would not have bound itself to lay the whole welfare of the country, at the feet of a particular class of its inhabitants.

There is a species of cabalistic phrase in use, which, upon all occasions, relative to the financial system, is at hand, to excommunicate the rest of the nation in favour of the capitalists. Whatever suggestion may be proposed, to reduce the exorbitant profits of the money market, it is always said to be opposed by "the faith of the country;"—as if the whole nation had sold itself to the monied interest, and would be guilty of sacrilege in attempting to make its escape. The nation would do well to consider, that much of its own prosperity depends upon its preserving the equilibrium between the rights of man, and the rights of money; neither of them must be considered; but as they promote the interests of each other: but, if we, under the idea of promoting the rights of man, were to pro-

vide no reward for surplus industry, we should offer no inducement for exertion ; and, therefore, whilst amusing man with his rights, we should be depriving him of comforts ; on the contrary, if, under the idea of preserving the rights of money, we give it a power of purchasing,—not our food out of our mouth,—not our corn-fields,—but our power of growing corn, in the smallest quantities beyond our immediate necessities,—we give it a power of putting us, at all times, upon an allowance ; and, in the event of scarcity, of reducing us to starvation. There is no preference, whether the man be sacrificed to the money, or the money to the man.

As to an argument, that is frequently used, in the gravest assemblies, and repeated in the most profound writings,—that the farmer would, under no circumstances, raise more corn than he could find an immediate market for, it would hardly be creditable to an assembly of children ; for, if it were not for the allurements held out to him by the interest of money, to pride himself rather on the amount of his Consols, than the value of his granaries, we should find him, upon any failing crop, as ready to supply the deficiency, at a moment's warning, as the merchants of Birmingham and Manchester were, to fit out the unexpected expedition to Buenos Ayres. If the farmer will not raise a

sufficient supply when the interest of money be five per cent. let the interest be reduced to four and a half per cent., and he will have a motive for placing his capital in agriculture, in preference to the funds.

It appears to me, that the supply of provisions is more like the political barometer, by which the interest of money ought to be regulated, than "the price of labour is, a political barometer, to shew the supply of provisions, and the demand for them" according to the opinion expressed by Mr. Malthus, in his chapter on "Poor Laws;" for, in a commercial and manufacturing country, the price of labour may be affected by a great variety of circumstances, even though the population, and the supply might keep a regular pace for years together; but if any part of the improved or improveable soil remain idle, while the supplies are unequal to the demands of the population, there is no possibility of doubting, that some temptation has been offered to the farmer, to induce him to neglect the best interests of his country. Is it ascertained, that the funds afford him a higher price for money than his farm? —the question is, which course is the best for the *general welfare*; to raise the price of commodities, or to lower the price of money? bearing always in mind, that the balance is turned as effectually by

diminishing the weight in one scale, as by adding to that in the other.

The object of these remarks, is, to prove what I observed in my Letter to Mr. Rose, that “we are not deficient in means, but in management.” If I am right in this respect, the mighty mass of poverty that rears itself at every step we take, is purely artificial, and neither owes its origin to physical incapacity, nor to moral lassitude; but to political oversight; in adding to the positive advantages of prosperity, the negative and reactive advantages of enabling the fortunate to limit the resources from whence their fortunes were derived, and to convert their own prosperity into a mean of distressing the public.

Upon these considerations, I cannot agree with Mr. Whitbread, as to the *necessity* of poverty forming any part of our political system; nor with Mr. Malthus, as to the necessity of checking our population. The arguments in favour of Mr. Whitbread’s position, seem to be precisely such, as might be used to prove that disease is an essential requisite of the human constitution; and the whole amount of Mr. Malthus’s argument is, that *the world will be filled with misery a thousand years hence; and, therefore, we ought to begin to be miserable in good time.* Now, as most of the persons who have assisted in the formation and administration of the pauper

system, as well as the system itself, have been influenced by these principles, I do enter my protest against any attempt being made to confirm a single vestige of it, whilst the people are wholly unprepared for the discussion.

In making this observation, however, I feel myself called upon, by every principle of justice and candour to disclaim any intention whatever, of attributing improper motives to either of the two gentlemen above named. Mr. Malthus's Work, is so full of just, humane, and benevolent sentiments, that, though I differ from him in his conclusion, I am sure that there is not a sober, a good, a just, or a poor man, in the kingdom, who ought not to rank that reverend and learned gentleman among the very best of his friends. I wish circumstances would permit his Work to be read, by every cottager and labourer in the united kingdom.

Of Mr. Whitbread, I again take the opportunity of observing, that I reason only upon the Speech attributed to him by the Reporters, who, I am persuaded, have not done justice to the sentiments of his benevolent mind : I think his attempt is wrong, not because I suppose him to be actuated by wrong motives, but because his situation in life, renders him incapable of entering into all the details necessary to qualify him for making his proposal. He has adopted the simple and universal axiom, that "some-

thing ought to be done;" and, acting according to the beggarly sentiments of the narrow-minded Whigs, it is natural for him to fancy, that all the experience and energies of the nation should be swallowed up in the "wisdom of parliament." When I declare then, that I differ from Mr. Whitbread as to the propriety of any reform of the Poor Laws originating in parliament, I do not conceal from myself, that I differ also from the whole of the Whigs, and from a very considerable part of the nation beside; and that it is the universality of the error, which may have led that honourable Gentleman to adopt a course, which, upon mature reflection, he will discover to be the very worst that he could have adopted.

What is to be done? is, indeed, a very important question; and the friends of parliamentary interference will gain but little by pointing it at me; for it is the difficulty of finding the just answer, that ought to make every senator wait for further evidence, before he comes to any decision upon this weighty concern; and, in the language of my motto, to declare—"I do not wish to interfere with the economy of the Poor: I wish the poor man to be left to himself, till he comes to us for help."

Here I must beg leave to disavow any design of undervaluing the wisdom of the legislature, or the talents of its individual members; I would admit,

that the Three Estates were all composed of the wisest, and most enlightened men that ever filled, and that ever would fill, those situations; and yet I would deny their capacity to enter into the merits of this subject, in a way that should enable them to adopt the measures most immediately called for by the wants of the people. It is neither sound judgment, nor honourable intentions, that will be sufficient, in this case. It is an intimate knowledge of the secret complaints, and an intermixture of feeling with the private desires, of the very lowest of the people, that alone can lead to measures most proper to be taken. It is an acquaintance, which persons of high rank cannot obtain for any price, nor by any exertion:—they may visit the cottages in the country, and the cellars and garrets in towns;—they may ask the most proper questions, and conduct themselves with all the affability that the most generous benevolence can condescend to; yet there is no possible character that they can assume, that will prevail upon the objects of their solicitude and care, to act unreservedly and undisguisedly before them, as they do before persons whom they can regard as their equals and companions.

But if it be difficult for persons of rank to collect the most correct information for themselves, they are still worse informed, if they attempt to make their inquiries by the intervention of obscure persons.

Few people are so little to be depended upon, as the *good men*, who are the collectors of charitable anecdotes for great men : their object, in paying benevolent visits, is, in general, any thing but what they profess it to be ; and the ostentatious demands that they usually make, in favour of rank and distinctions, send them away, still further from the truth than their employers would have have been, if they had made their own inquiries.

Of riches and poverty it may be said, not without limitation indeed, that there is a gulph fixed, which separates the two states from each other. No small shopkeeper, mechanic, or labourer who has to attend to his business for twelve hours in a day, during six days in a week, can, by any possible strength of his imagination, tell what is doing, or ought to be done, at the minister's levee, or the fashionable drawing-room :—these are other worlds to him ; and, if he has never betrayed his ignorance by attempting to regulate their arrangements, it is because circumstances have never called upon him to take their management out of the hands of those for whose accommodation they were designed. Equally remote are all the concerns of low-life from the skill and penetration of the elevated world ; and it would have been a happy circumstance for this country, if circumstances had left the rich as little inclination to meddle in the affairs of the poor, as

the poor have power to meddle in the affairs of the rich.

No person will attempt to depreciate the evils complained of by Mr. Whitbread, at the time that the legislature began to interfere in the affairs of the Poor: but the honourable Gentleman has not dealt fairly with his own judgment, if he has not examined, what would have been the probable effect of leaving all the sturdy beggars, vagrants, &c. without any provision, but their liberty to go where they thought proper, and to employ themselves in the best manner that they could. The state of the times was, unquestionably, against their employing and providing for themselves all at once; but is there any man, in his sober senses, who will pretend, that, if parliament had omitted passing its acts of settlement, and other acts, to restrain and prevent them from living honestly and industriously: is there, I say, any sane person who thinks that in such a case, the people would have been so ill off as they are at present? Every attempt made in parliament, to reform the errors of this system, and every volume, written with the same view, (although a false delicacy, that prevails in all cases wherein Government is concerned, suppresses the truth) is, in fact, a declaration, that the interference of Government, upon those occasions, was mischievous. They are, altogether, so many acknowledgments, that the government of that time

was ignorant of what it was about, and ought to be taken, by the present Government, as admonitions, to caution it against following the example.

Assenting, as I do, to the general declaration, that “something must be done ;” and being assured that *that something*, must be done by the people themselves ; this is the proper place for me to observe, that the only thing the legislature can do to promote the objects, which the interests of the whole country, from the highest to the lowest, require to be fully accomplished, is, *to undo all that their predecessors have done*. This would be to place the people, as they are now, mistakenly, said to be, “all equal before the law.” Such an act would involve in it the abolition of all the laws of settlement ; the repeal of all the laws against monopolies and combinations of workmen ; the entire alteration of the system of finance ; the overthrow of the corporations, and the reform of parliament. It would place the people, for the first time, in a state of civilization, they would be at peace among themselves ;—but it would be a state for which they are so ill prepared, that it would afford them no pleasure : they would be greatly benefited by the contemplation of those objects ;—but the sudden possession of them would place so great a number of persons in new relations of life, at one time, that we should

half of us finish our days, before we had learned the precise situation that would be proper for us to fill under the new state of things.

Reforms are never less beneficial for being conducted slowly, supposing them to be rightly commenced : and, as I think a great part of the effervescence and passion has subsided, which, for some time, served to blind a great number of zealots, who appeared in the characters of reformers and anti-reformers ; I am persuaded, that parliament cannot be long content to postpone the great and necessary work of national reform. To make such a reform useful, it ought to create new interests, that should go before it, and meet the persons who would be likely to complain of their property being disturbed by the removal of existing abuses ; for no changes ought to be made with sufficient violence to destroy, without compensation or sufficient warning, the right of any individual, which, however injurious it may be to the nation, he acquired possession of without being guilty of any legal crime. The admission of this principle would obviate all the objections which are raised by the clamours of interested individuals, and the means would be found in the first effort of courage that would enter upon the task.

There is one very material point, that the Government ought to have in view, which principally re-

regards its own conduct, and that is, to make such arrangements as shall enable the people, in all cases, to do as much as they possibly can for themselves: this ought to be the leading design of all our reforms, as it would give a degree of activity to many thousands of idle persons, who are now always in attendance upon the tardy decisions of parliament.

The people of Denmark, and of the colonies belonging to Denmark, think themselves the happiest people in the world; and the reason they assign for it is, that their government has none of that talent for meddling, which the governments of all other countries are cursed with. Whilst the laws of England are snares for the people, the laws of Denmark are rules; they are said to be contained in a single volume, and are sufficiently understood to be obeyed. The people are less vexed than the English, but they are more virtuous: yet the people of England would be as virtuous as the people of Denmark, if the Government of England would leave them more to themselves.

The first measure that parliament can, I think, with propriety, take is, *to repeal all the laws of settlement, and leave the people at liberty to carry their talents and exertions wherever they can best dispose of them.* This is, I am satisfied, an indispensable step; but, at the same time, it is the *only* step that parliament ought to take, until it be called upon

to proceed farther, by the express desire of a majority of the people ; for it is alone by means of this measure, that the true nature of the evils, of which we complain, can be ascertained.

Nothing is easier than to propose amendments, except it be, to find fault at once with systems and the amendments suggested for them ; but to ascertain the facts, upon which the success of complicated systems depends, is a work of great difficulty ; and we are yet ignorant of almost every fact that is necessary to guide the judgment, through the important discussion, that Mr. Whitbread has introduced into parliament.

The Morning Chronicle, in the slovenly report that it has given of Mr. Whitbread's Speech, has omitted to insert anything that he said, upon the subject of providing employment for the people ; but, it is understood, that, in answer to a question put to him by Mr. Rose, he promised not to neglect that point in his Bill. Now can there be any thing like senatorial wisdom ;—is there anything like common prudence, in putting at the tail, what in the nature of things, ought to be put at the head ? Labour ought to be made the grand resource, to be amalgamated and carried to market with every atom of the national wealth ; it should be regarded as a staple commodity, *the principle dependence ; and should be held out as a sure and invariable source of

individual comfort, in as full a sense as the productions of the soil are a source of national hope. The very first question that ought to be asked by a statesman—at least by every gentleman who designs to attend in his place, to vote upon Mr. Whitbread's proposal, is, What are our means for employing the people? and then, Have we used all the means we possess? The legislators who have amused themselves with framing Poor Laws, and not attempted these inquiries, have imagined themselves political economists, before they had learned the A. B. C. of the science; and, it is most distressingly demonstrated to us, that they had better have played at battle-dore and shuttlecock, or any other childish amusement, than one in which their ignorance could be so extensively mischievous.

To think of determining either of these questions, whilst the Laws of Settlement remain in use, would be absurd; for the price of labour cannot find its level, until every person who has any to dispose of, can take it wherever he thinks proper, and either depress the market by its quantity, or take the benefit of its scarcity, without the possibility of his being removed from any such place against his will, unless by death. It never could happen, in this case, that labour could rise in any place above what would be its just value, compared with its value in any other place; but a still more important

advantage would be, that the precise quantity of regular employment could be ascertained, which each district is capable of affording; and we might learn the important fact, whether we have really more hands than means of employing them.

Upon this result, depends the line of conduct that it would be proper to adopt; for, if we have employment enough to keep the people at work, what occasion have we to extend our funds for paupers; and if we have not, how can we bestow any, even the smallest fund, so well, as by devising new means of employment, to enable the people to gain their livelihood without becoming paupers? I cannot help very seriously regretting, that this, which is the leading feature of the subject, and the only parliamentary part of the subject, should have been, almost entirely, overlooked by Mr. Whitbread; yet, I have no hesitation in saying, that though Parliament will wholly waste its time, if it proceeds in any other way, that the people may do much in accomplishing the principal things that are immediately required to be done, if Parliament will but leave them unfettered by Mr. Whitbread's regulations.

There is no argument that can be urged against sudden reforms, that does not apply to the Poor Laws in all their ramifications; and, upon that ground, I am persuaded, that the remedies to be

applied to the Pauper Scheme, will be the more effectual, for proceeding without violence.

The principal point to be gained is, to get rid of the Poor's Rate; for whether we talk of educating, or employing, or reforming the people, it is always with a view of using the means most conducive to this end. As men, indeed, we may be pleased enough to see people sober, industrious, and able to read their bibles; but, when we are sure that any person will not become chargeable to the parish, we do not give ourselves any trouble about these things, with regard to him. Our cares then are confined to those only, who are likely to become chargeable; and hence it is evident, that by diminishing the number of persons who might become chargeable, we diminish the number of our cares. This is, however, a business in which a member of Parliament has not a whit more interest, than any individual who pays the rate, nor so much as thousands who cannot afford to pay as well; and, surely, it is likely to be more generally assisted, if every person so interested, be left at liberty to aid it as he pleases, than if Parliament engrosses all the labour to itself.

It is to effect this reduction in the Poor's Rate, that Mr. Whitbread proposes his Commission Bank; and, as I do not know anything of its organization, I do not object to it upon any other ground, than

upon the folly of attempting to effect, by the authority of Government, what would be much easier and better effected without it; but, upon this ground, if there were no other, every Englishman ought to resist the plan, as he would resist a pestilence.

To the principle, of the establishment of such an institution, under the authority of Government, there are several very great objections; the first, is, that the power and patronage of Government is already greater than is consistent with the independence of the people, and the liberties of the country; the second, that the business of Government is already too extensive, to be properly executed; the third, that, by entering into a commercial transaction with the people, it might occasionally appear in the piebald character of defendant and judge at the same time. It is, besides, to be considered, that if Government, by its commissioners, were to carry on this Bank for any length of time, it would acquire an authority over the great mass of the people, more arbitrary than it could establish by an army of foreign mercenaries; for it would proceed silently, and without exciting suspicion, until the common people were all at its mercy; and no person, possessed of the elective franchise, could possibly vote against the orders of government without exposing himself to endless vexations.

That this Bank would be a considerable expense

to the nation ought to be no obstacle to its establishment, for any measure that is useful must be attended with expense; but when it is considered, that this is to be an expense incurred *by the Government*, and may, probably, be arranged according to the economy of some such gentleman as Mr. Alexander Davison, it is met by a very serious objection upon that score.

To the principle of establishing a Bank for the economical, I cannot object, for I recommended the measure six months before the death of Mr. Pitt, in my Letter to Mr. Rose; and I had commenced such a Bank in the metropolis, near a year before Mr. Whitbread made his motion; my objection, therefore, is, to having the principle shackled by parliamentary obstructions, at a time when it is proceeding towards its object with a degree of regularity that would enable it, if left to itself, to furnish parliament with all the facts necessary to guide its judgment, by the time that the subscribers would know the amount of the assistance, that such an Institution might require of the legislature.

If Mr. Whitbread's plan, and mine, possess equal merit, it is of little consequence to the public which of them falls in favour of the other; but it is of much consequence to the public to examine, whether the persons who offer to serve them be influenced by a *de-*

sire of doing good, or a love of fame. In this respect, cannot refuse to enter into a comparison with any gentleman who is desirous of getting his plans adopted: for I have been invariably willing to sacrifice my Plan, to any gentleman who might be willing to try his. I have been as willing to lend any assistance, of which I was capable, to forward any such attempt as if it were my own; but I could find no gentlemen agreeable to go beyond theorizing upon paper, until they saw me reducing my Plan to practice; and now I have proved that the Poor's Rate may be reduced without any legislative assistance whatever, they are eager to get parliamentary plans adopted. Mr. Whitbread, in particular, I cannot suppose to be influenced by the pure and unalloyed desire of doing good; for if he had, he might have saved me a vast deal of trouble, expense, and risk, by simply informing me, that it was his intention to oppose the operation of my Plan; and I see very little to praise in any individual, who, whilst he is canting about public good, can sport with private feeling.

Of the honourable Gentleman's Plan itself, I can say little, for I know nothing more of it than is contained in his Speech: but, if it be true, that his Bank is to be confined to London, and to receive only the savings of persons who can bring to it twenty shillings at a time, it is a most impotent and

ridiculous scheme. I can very readily account for his wishing to overthrow my Institution, and to destroy its friends in its fall, upon the Whig principle, that would pursue Sir Home Popham, and the Committee at Lloyd's, to destruction, for attempting to do good without orders; but I can trace no principle, in his rejecting information that would have taught him how he might have secured the objects he professes to have in view.

Is there, I would ask, one man of good sense in the country, beside Mr. Whitbread, who will believe that the Poor's Rate can be reduced, or the condition of the people improved, by confining the services of this Bank to persons who can pay twenty shillings at a time? These are not the people who become chargeable to the parishes, though every facility ought to be given to them as much as if they were: but it is to those who never can keep sixpence in their pockets, without yielding to the temptations of the alehouse and the gin-shop, that such an Institution should be accommodated. This is done by the Institution called "TRANQUILITY;" and its practicability is now demonstrated, by the circumstance of this very description of persons coming and paying their sixpences and shillings as they can spare them.

Upon the books of this Institution, there are already a number of persons who pay nothing to-

wards the Poor's Rate, and a proportion of whom, according to the course of things, must have become chargeable to their parishes: but who, if allowed to continue their exertions, in proportion to their means, (as this Institution now assists them to do) will be able to provide for themselves, and to preserve their independence. What will Mr. Whitbread have done more than this, if he should get his Bank adopted; and how will he prove that his motives in proposing it are precisely such as they ought to have been, after having refused to make the inquiries necessary to satisfy himself, whether the Bank that I have commenced, be not as well calculated to answer the purpose as his own?

Let the legislature and the public pause, before they suffer themselves to be crippled again, for two centuries, by a new parliamentary system. Whilst the people, in the several counties and cities, keep their concerns under their own management, and their funds in their own hands, they will always be able to correct any palpable error that may arise, by means of their own bye laws; but, if they become tackled to the machinery of Government, they must wait, not merely for the delays that attend all parliamentary proceedings, but, what will be more injurious still—they must wait the leisure of a minister.

What an absurdity does such a supposition involve! Parliament is already so pressed with busi-

ness, that the members are obliged to spend half the night to get through it; and the ministers are so occupied with their duties, that they are perpetually obliged to call in the aid of committees of inquiry, because they are incapable of attending to the public accounts; and yet they must be embarrassed with a concern, which the nature of their avocations, and the pursuits of their minds, tend to unfit them for.

As the want of leisure would make it inconvenient that either the legislature, or the ministers, should be troubled with such a Bank, so it would be equally improper that it should be assigned to the magistrates; for no person, who has paid the least attention to public business, can be ignorant of the hasty, and slovenly manner in which it is frequently done, from the magistrates being troubled with a vast variety of concerns, that ought never to have been assigned to them.

All the labour required by the cause of benevolence, as well as the sums raised for its promotion, ought to be voluntary; and the objection against resting upon voluntary exertions, grounded upon the experiment having failed in the reigns of Henry the Eighth, Edward the Sixth, &c. are wholly without point in this case; for the people had good reason to resist the claims in those days, upon the fair and just argument, that those who had seized upon the treasures of the church, which had served

to keep the Poor, ought, in strict justice, to maintain the Poor out of those revenues. The case is now very different: every one feels, that, by assisting to establish a new system, he shall ease himself of a burden; and experience daily proves, that, independent of this motive, great numbers of the liberal and well-intentioned part of the community devote a large portion of their leisure to these kinds of improvement.

To make the improvements to be introduced essential, whatever they may be, they should admit all the exertion that possibly could be made in their favour, by the whole body of the nobility, gentry, merchants, tradesmen, and persons of all sects, parties, and descriptions, without requiring what would be either inconvenient, or, offensive to any one person amongst them. If Mr. Whitbread's Plan possesses those advantages, I shall be sorry that he had not taken pains to make it more generally understood; but, as my own object is to engage the attention of every person, who can be prevailed upon to examine whatever relates to the Institution called—"Tranquillity," I will endeavour to shew, that there is nothing to prevent persons, of the very smallest means, from becoming subscribers to an Economical Bank, as well as subscribers of large sums.

I have already observed, that, if proper pains were taken, the claims upon the Pauper Fund, that

might be supposed to accrue subsequent to the year 1798, might be gradually diminished: this I propose to effect, by inducing all persons, whatever may be their circumstances, from the season of youth, or as early as they can be prevailed upon, to begin to treasure up what they can conveniently spare, to make provision for age, which is considered to be 56 years, if they choose to receive their annuities at that time.

The contemptuous manner in which the idea of extending the benefits of this Bank to persons paying only small and irregular sums, has been treated, arises from an opinion, that very great difficulties would occur in keeping the accounts: yet the contrary is the fact; for, though the subscribers are left entirely to suit their own convenience, and are neither bound to pay at any particular time, nor any particular sums, the accounts are kept with the greatest ease. They can be comprehended in five minutes by the weakest capacity. Every person knows the precise state of his account at all times; and these accounts are so managed, that, if the subscriber fails to pay for seven years together, he never forfeits any part of what he has paid, but is entitled, at the age of 56, to the full amount of his payments with the interest upon them, whatever they may have been.

To explain this more clearly, I annex a Copy

of the Ticket, which each Subscriber receives on making his first payment, and which he brings with him on making every subsequent payment, in the course of one year.

This Ticket contains an exact copy of the Subscribers account in the Book of the Institution, and is so contrived, that it can contain as many entries as there are weeks in the year ; it being supposed, that as the Subscribers are at liberty to make their payments whenever they please, some may choose to pay as often as once a week.

Those who think proper to pay once a week, may sometimes have to make payments five times in the course of a calendar month ; and it being desirable to keep all the payments of one month together, there are five divisions for each.

The sums are entered in the first, second, third, fourth, or fifth divisions, according to the weeks in which they are paid ; and at the end of the month, they are drawn out in the money column.

(Copy)

TRANQUILLITY.

OFFICE, No. 2, ALBION STREET, BLACKFRIARS BRIDGE.

This Ticket must be exchanged at the end of the year.

If a Member remove he must write his new Address on the back: if he be unmarried and marries, he must specify the time of his Wife's birth. Married Members are to specify the names, and time of birth, of each of their children.

Every Member, when he pays his money, must take care to see the amount entered on his Ticket, and also in the RECEIPT Book of the Institution; otherwise the Sum will never be acknowledged to his credit, but will be forfeited to the Extra Fund.

1807. Page 20.

John Lucas, Ivory-turner—————

born 15th June 1772————resides No. 58————

Aylesbury Street, Clerkenwell—————married

Sarah, his now Wife—————

born 2d March 1774 has Four Children viz.————

Sarah born 4th November 1799.

Jane born 17th January 1801.

John born 6th May 1804. .

Elizabeth born 3d July 1805.

1807.						£	s.	d.
<i>Brought forward</i>						2	15	0
JANUARY	—	5th 1s	15th 2s	—	29th 2s	0	5	0
FEBRUARY . .	2d 1s 6d	14th 2s	—	—	—	0	3	6
MARCH	4th 6d	13th 1s 6d	21st 1s	—	30th 6d	0	3	6
APRIL	—	10th 6d	—	23d 1s	—	0	1	8
MAY	—	—	—	—	30th 1s	0	1	0
JUNE	—	10th 2s	—	—	—	0	2	0
JULY	—	—	—	26th 6d	31st 3s	0	3	6
AUGUST	—	8th 2s	15th 2s	22d 1s	29th 2s 6d	0	7	6
SEPTEMBER .	—	12th 1s	19th 6d	26th 6d	—	0	2	0
OCTOBER . . .	3d 1s	—	—	24th 2s	31st 6d	0	3	6
NOVEMBER . .	—	9th 6d	19th 1s	—	30th 6d	0	2	0
DECEMBER . .	—	12th 1s	18th 6d	—	29th 3s	0	4	6
Interest						0	2	9
Amount carried forward £						4	17	3

Each Member is furnished
with one of these Tickets,
that he may constantly
have a Copy of his Ac-
count.

The proceeding is the same for every month: the spaces in which there are no figures, being those weeks in which the Subscriber made no payment, is filled up with a dash—.

At the end of each year the amount is cast up, and the total carried to the top of a new Ticket, as the beginning of a new year's account, in the manner of the two pounds fifteen shillings, entered as the first article of the "*Copy*," on the other side, which is supposed to be brought forward from 1806.

The old Ticket is always returned to the office on the receipt of a new one, and the account current is kept in the same way as before, until the end of the second, and every subsequent year; when the interest being ascertained for the sum brought forward from the former year, is placed under the monthly items, and cast up to find a new total, for the purpose of carrying it forward again in like manner.

A similar process takes place from year to year, until the age of fifty-six, when the Subscriber is entitled to an annuity proportioned by the amount of his Subscription, and the annuity, as correctly ascertained, is ten per cent. upon the aggregate amount of his payments, and the compound interest; with a proviso, that when the interest of money is below five per cent., the directors may, if they think re-

quisite, reduce the annuities proportionably below ten per cent.

This method encourages every Subscriber to do the best he can for himself, from an assurance, that the benefit he will receive will be proportioned by his exertions;—if his annuity should be small, it will be, because he subscribed but little; but if he subscribed regularly and largely, he is equally sure that his subscription will not be appropriated to any one but himself.

The other side of the Ticket, contains the Subscriber's designation and address, with the registers of himself, his wife, and all his children; and these are all entered in the same form in our Book, having the sum paid, specified on his Ticket: so that we know the precise number of all the families dependent upon the Subscribers.

Much useful information, in a statistical point of view, would result from the source which this arrangement opens to the inquirer; but that, which is the more immediate object of the Institution, is to aid itself in forming some idea of the number of widows and orphans that might, in the course of events, be distressed by the deaths of its Subscribers.

This remark, however, must not be understood as an insinuation, that the Subscribers have views beyond their own exertions for themselves and families. We have some very respectable people,

who, whilst they are desirous of setting an example to their servants and workmen, are wise enough to see that fortune might lower, even upon themselves, at a moment, when the provision, thus easily made, would be to them like rain in due season. This is virtue, and it is virtue that ought to be met without a Badge, or a stigma of any kind, even in the midst of distress:—this is virtue that should be raised while it were yet tottering, and should be saved from falling, at any expense.

I cannot divest myself of the persuasion, that the Subscribers to this Institution will meet their share of misfortunes with the rest of mankind—that at least, they will die and leave widows and orphans; some sick, some helpless, and many unprovided for. These we ought, in point of consistency, to regard as a part of our family; and, I hope, we shall always find some of our benevolent collection sermon preachers, ready to say a word or two for them to the public. Will they not be objects of benevolence, and would it not afford pleasure to the liberal mind, to “visit the *virtues* of the fathers upon the children,” in such cases? Mr. Whitbread’s idea of rewarding industry and care forms a leading feature of my plan; but instead of his Badge of merit, I would give every worthy man an assurance, that under no possible adversity, should his widow and orphans be deserted.

Upon the same principle, that the accounts are kept as before described, youth, of both sexes, who depend upon their labour, are permitted to pay in their savings, which are kept in the same manner, and encreased at compound interest, until they marry, when the whole amount is returned to them, to enable them to begin the world. I hope I shall find a generous spirit in the Public, ready to encourage this disposition in the rising generation, by enabling the funds to increase these sums by proportionate premiums. If these juvenile Subscribers remain unmarried, at twenty-five, they are permitted to withdraw all that they have paid, with the compound interest upon it, but without premium. This I take to be a better mode of stopping the distressing effects of prostitution, than by means of Magdalens, and Penitentiaries, about which such vast sums are idly wasted.

After all that has been already written upon this Institution, it would be impertinent to enter *fully* into its plan in this Tract: yet, it may not be improper to observe, that the utmost care has been taken to found, and conduct it upon the purest principles of honour and integrity. Its concerns are all open to the most scrutinizing inspection; and every gentleman, desirous of promoting its objects, will receive any kind of explanation that he may take the trouble of requiring. It is not the design of

this Institution to promote any interest that is not common to *every individual of the community*; and, therefore, it does not appeal to any political party, or to any religious sect, for particular countenance, but trusts, that the liberal-minded, and independent, of all parties, and all sects, will unite in promoting its success.

With regard to the expenses of the Institution, it is so contrived, that, though every Subscriber must receive a greater value for his payments, than by any other mode, yet, that in the event of its being acceded to by considerable numbers, the joint subscriptions shall be sufficient to defray its expenses, without making any charge whatever to the Subscribers. This will appear evident by returning to the Copy of the Account Ticket, from the description of which, it appears, that the Subscriber receives credit for the full amount of his collected payments, with the compound interest upon them, until the time when his annuity commences; and the calculations are so made, that his annuity is granted at its utmost value. So far then, it is clear, that he is charged nothing for management; but, upon casting up the total of the money column, it will be seen, that the amount is made up without any allowance of interest for the current year; and it will occur to every one, that the interest of an immense number of those trifling sums must be very considerable.

This interest, when it arrived at a certain amount, would, of itself, be sufficient to support the expenses of the Institution, and yet the charge be nothing to the Subscribers; for they would make no more of their money, if they were to lay their shillings and sixpences by in any other way, until they arrived at the yearly aggregate.

During the interval that it will take to make the nature of the plan generally known, the expenses are defrayed by the voluntary subscriptions of THE FRIENDS OF TRANQUILLITY, whose attendance at the Committee for superintending the progress, management, expenditure, and every concern of the Institution, is most earnestly and respectfully requested. To the friends of the country I appeal for the aid of their generosity, in behalf of this Institution; not upon any calculation that Mr. Whitbread's Bill will be thrown out of parliament, but, that if his measure should be adopted, the nation may have an opportunity of examining, whether the whole of this business might not be better conducted, if Government could be prevailed upon to *let the people alone*.

Though it would be improper that this Concern should be placed under the authority of Government, it is particularly to be desired, that the most cordial co-operation should exist between its Directors and such of the great officers of state, and public men,

as in consequence of their situations and interest in the confidence of the people, could, at all times, be relied upon, to check any irregular proceedings, (if such should ever arise) in its management. It is, therefore, among the fundamental principles of "Tranquillity," that the following illustrious and respectable characters be always honorary Directors of the Institution; viz. the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury; the Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain; the First Lord of the Treasury; the Right Honourable the Chancellor of the Exchequer; the First Lord of the Admiralty; the Commander in Chief of his Majesty's Forces; the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Middlesex; the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Surry; the Right Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons; the Right Honourable His Majesty's Attorney General; the two Representatives in Parliament for the County of Middlesex; the two Representatives in Parliament for the County of Surry; the four Representatives in Parliament for the City of London; the two Representatives in Parliament for the City of Westminster; the two Representatives in Parliament for the Borough of Southwark; the Right Honourable the Lord Mayor of London; the Governor of the Bank of England; and the Chairman of the Honourable the East India Company.

As it would be highly objectionable that such an Institution should be bound to wait the leisure of the Minister or the Parliament, it would be equally so that the affairs of one town should wait the convenience of a commissioner, or a body of directors in another town; and there is nothing in the nature of the thing to prevent such Institutions being commenced in every populous place for the convenience of its district, and to be perfectly independent of each other. In all such cases, the representatives in Parliament, the lords lieutenants, and persons holding distinguished offices in the vicinity, should be official directors.

By engaging the talents and attention of the county to the subject in this way, some general and uniform opinion may be formed as to what would be the kind of assistance that Parliament could afford; and that question cannot be answered unless some pains be taken, more than hitherto have been, to ascertain the facts.

The reasoning upon this subject is not altered by what appears to be the leading design of Mr. Whitbread's Plan—that of introducing Mr. Lancaster's mode of education into general use. Of the value of Mr. Lancaster's system, and the importance of getting it generally introduced, no dispassionate man can have any doubt: but upon what principle, unless upon that of the Spartan-tyranny, which sacrificed all private feeling to public convenience—shall any

man be bound to send his child to the seminary that another man appoints for him? Let the condition of the people be improved, and their own inclinations will, as daily experience evinces, lead them to consult the welfare of their offspring, by educating them according to the best of their ability; but, if this plan of education be carried into effect “by authority of Parliament,” whatever pains may be taken to render it as little degrading as possible, it will differ very little from the parish charity schools at present existing, where the children are not merely placed under the scourge of an insolent and petty tyrant, whose very relationship to them leads him to treat them with degradation and contempt, but where they are wholly out of the power and relief of their parents. It would be unreasonable to affirm, that circumstances had never occurred of children being well educated in those schools: but, in the general, they are so capriciously and unequally treated, that they acquire very few just habits of thinking, and are, in many cases, so frequently vexed by the groundless exercise of authority, that before they quit them, they consider it a matter of indifference whether they do right or wrong. It is thus that numbers, of both sexes, trace the abandonment of character up to the treatment they received in those *uncharitable* schools.

Any system of education, or reform, intended “to

exalt the character of the labourer," or, "to promote the good order of society," ought to be especially calculated to conform the manners of the rising generation to the fulfilment of all the relative duties: for it is irrational to expect that man to be a good citizen who has been taught to despise the authority that nature appointed to make him a good son; and it is not possible that a child can respect the authority of a father, who is obliged to continue him under the rod of a master, that punishes him without fault. But what power has a father over his child if he suffers him to be placed under the tutorage of a person who is unaccountable to him? he has his redress, it is true, he can complain to the governors; yet this is only when they have time to hear him; and, if he gets that hearing, a trite lecture upon "sparing the rod, and spoiling the child," generally tends to give both father and child a more degraded opinion of themselves than they had before.

I know that the general habit which prevails, of complimenting this country on account of its charities, will not be very likely to give these observations a welcome reception: but, for myself, I wish the reflecting part of the community to examine the disadvantages, as well as the benefits, of our diffuse system of charity. The people are, in my mind, frequently brought in debtors to this system when

they have really no obligations to acknowledge. In England, it is said, that there are more magnificent establishments for the Poor than there are in all the countries of the world beside: this information, however, will go a very little way to flatter the vanity of any Englishman, who has taken his observation with him into foreign countries: few persons, for example, have ever passed through Amsterdam, with a native of that city, without hearing the same claim set up in favour of Holland; and, truly, it requires a nice discrimination to determine, whether, in point of either number or magnificence, the Dutch institutions are inferior to those of England. I am, indeed, disposed to think that the balance is in favour of the English in this respect; but if the people receive less charity, they have the advantage of an independence and manliness of character, that the inferior classes of English do not possess; and this observation I make as well with regard to the Brabanters, and those of the French whom I have seen, as to the Dutch.

There is one simple distinction between English charity and any other charity that I have observed, which goes nearly (if not entirely) the whole way in producing what may be considered the brutal character of the English; I mean, the kind of right that it establishes of entering into the private concerns, and regulating the inclinations of its recipients, so

that the common people are left without a will upon the most trifling occasions. In the countries above alluded to, nobody would think of censuring the pride of the potboy or the shoeboy, because he had spent his few livres or guildres in the most fashionable article of dress that it would afford him. "Win gold and wear it," seems to give equal elasticity to the hopes of the drudge and the sportive; and the consciousness that he may make himself as fine as he can with the frippery that his few shillings will procure, gives to the most inferior servant a motive for endeavouring to be as tasty and well-behaved as his master; hence the working classes of people are not so rude and uncivil in those countries as they are in England.

English bigotry has made taste and pride among the labouring people as criminal as English law has made vagrancy; and hence, if the Pauper System once brings an industrious man in debtor to it, he, and all his family, are, ever afterwards, haunted by the censorious reproaches of his charitable neighbours, if ever they attempt to throw off the Badge of their dependence, by assuming anything like politeness, either in their manners or dress.

I do not mind the sneers and scoffs that this observation will raise: I will acknowledge, that the peasant boy, and the polished boy, have equal rights, before the law, in this respect; but, if the

partisans of distinction cannot assail their poor emulous neighbours with the battering ram of the law, they accomplish their end quite as successfully with the significant and powerful term, "Upstart!" which, like a well-hung swivel, turns to every point that they desire to attack; and this term is sufficient, in England, to shut up a man's shop, and justify all the charitable for refusing to employ him until they shall have reduced him to his native degradation. To this narrow spirit most of the English dissoluteness owes its origin.

If it be true, that seven millions are annually expended in charity, in this country, it would, perhaps, be no discredit to its mercantile talents, if it would calculate what relation this sum bears to the degree of comfort produced by it among the poor. Such an inquiry would, I am persuaded, tend to prove, that half the money, if paid to the people in the form of wages, would enable them to procure double the quantity of comfort for themselves, upon Mr. Whitbread's own principle, that "the people have an astonishing facility of laying out money more to their advantage, than the rich could lay it out for them."

Nothing can be more direct than the application of these arguments to Mr. Lancaster's Plan. Supposing five hundred poor men to send each of them a child to that Gentleman's seminary, respectable as

it now is, on account of its independence: the tutor would have every motive for consulting the interest of the children, and the pleasure of the parents; and little doubt will be entertained, but, that at the year's end, the attentive fathers having been always ready to make their complaints to him, if any cause had existed, would, on the contrary, have to return him their thanks for the conscientious fulfilment of his duty. Both parties would thus be satisfied, and the trifling sums agreed upon for the fulfilment of the conditions, would constitute the whole expense; and the same thing might be said of every such school, if there were tutors enough to commence one in every village, or even street. It would be very different if all, or either of those schools, were to be placed under any kind of authority beside that of the parents, for then the father's watchfulness would be of no value, it would be thrown away:—the master might, indeed, be equally attentive, and conscientious in the discharge of his duty, but his conscientiousness would be of as little worth; that also must be thrown away: and for what? why, to provide a sinecure for a commissioned Inspector, whose only business—whose only function in the political system, from the moment of his appointment, would be, to rob the people of the power of doing their own business, and then to bring them under an obligation for receiving the injury!

Could it be supposed, that Mr. Lancaster would descend from the high and independent rank that he now holds, and sink into a generalissimo of pensioned schoolmasters, what compensation could Government make him, that would not be equal to the emolument he derives from his present school?—None. It is, therefore evident, that he must, in such a case, receive a salary equal in value to the education of the number of children that now reap the benefit of his talents; and, this money would be taken out of the pockets of the people of England, to do what they could do a great deal better themselves, if the Government would but let them alone. The mischief would be just as great if the Government, instead of appointing this Gentleman, were to appoint any other to such an employment; and, if their number were increased, it would multiply in proportion.

When Mr. Whitbread talks of the expense being no object in this case, he really seems as if he had got on the ministerial side of the House. What, is it nothing whether the people lay out their own money, or the Government take it, and lay it out against their will? Is it nothing, whether the people expend a small sum to please themselves, or the Government charge them double, to vex and degrade them? Money ought, indeed, to be no object

in any case where it would “improve the morals and comforts of the people;” but I could point out twenty ways in which the morals and comforts of the people could be very greatly improved, for half the expense that this measure will cost to degrade and distress them; not one of which, I think, Mr. Whitbread would take the trouble of making a motion for.—There would be no fame attending them, and they would create no patronage.

Beside these objections, I think a very strong one arises out of the impossibility of Government interfering with this plan, without throwing all its advantages into the hands of the Established Church in a short time. I am satisfied that Mr. Whitbread can have no such design, and there can be little reason to doubt, but that, in the outset, every care will be taken to give the children of Dissenters the same advantages as the children of Churchmen. It is not, however, in the nature of the thing, that whilst all the appointments must necessarily be made by Churchmen, the feelings of Dissenters will continue long to be consulted. The consequence will be, that Dissenters will be obliged to withdraw their children from those schools, and bear the expense of educating them themselves; but the system will then be formed, the taxes will be settled for its maintenance, and the whole nation will be obliged to pay for a large and unnecessary Institution, that will be

supported as the Established Church now is—for one particular sect alone.

The mischiefs of such an infamous exertion of authority would be endless; and the moment in which the whole country should become tributary to the most unprincipled of invaders, or that the last inch of its soil should be ploughed up and washed away in the ocean, would be a moment of happiness, in the abstract, compared with that in which the authority of law might be given to this source of inveterate and continual dissention. I have not the least design by these remarks, to disparage any one sect in favour of another; my own connexions lie equally among Churchmen and Dissenters; and daily experience convinces me, that the suspicions which they entertain of each others bigotry, is entirely unfounded. In all cases in which the law does not set them jangling, they can unite with one another as men and brethren; and, if the mischievous consequences of this childish and ridiculous project should ever take place, the blame will not be due to the members of the Church, for they have shewn no desire for it—it will be forced upon them, and the whole fault must be attributed to the injudicious meddling of Mr. Whitbread, who could not be contented to *let the people alone*.

To the plan itself, however, I must again repeat, that my objections are not principally directed; it

is the attempt to procure a new lease of the pauper system by act of Parliament, that I object to; and I do not make these objections with any desire of sowing discontent or sedition among the people. I would call upon the whole population to resist the interference of Parliament, as zealously, if it were about to force them to sit in palaces, and to wear laces and brocades, as I do call upon every honest man to shew his abhorrence of its interference in this case. It would be an act of tyranny, worse than any that the very worst of the Whigs ever attempted before, or than any that the Jacobins of France ever accomplished.

Mr. Whitbread's conscience, in this attempt, is, I am sure, at variance with his conduct; and it was under a momentary spur of that conscience, that he declared, in the language of my motto, "*I do not wish to interfere with the economy of the poor, when it can be avoided. I neither want to touch the arrangement of their families, nor to meddle with their earnings, with their food, with their clothing, with their habitations, nor any of their concerns.—I wish the poor man to be left to himself, until he ask for legislature interference—it is time enough for us to interfere, when he comes to us for help.*"

When the honourable Gentleman's conscience suggested this train of reasoning to him, he saw that

the duty of the Government towards the people was two-fold; first, to avoid shackling and fettering them, even by its kindness, unnecessarily; and secondly, to give them the help they require whenever they ask it. This suggestion is at once a reproach to the former governments, and a rule to the present; it prescribes the very best argument that can be furnished against any further attempt to mimic the foolish meddling of Elizabeth's "Philosophers;" and it points out the original sin of the pauper system, in language that the people of England ought to remind Mr. Whitbread of, to the very last moment, that the recollection shall be able to bear a single trace of his plan. Upon this sentiment, I wish to rivet the attention of the public, and I will not weaken its power by enlarging upon its import—It defines in itself, the MEANS OF THE GOVERNMENT, and the WANTS OF THE PEOPLE: it is a candid declaration, that the legislature can do nothing better than to destroy all that has been done by its predecessors; and, it is an acknowledgment, that the best method of promoting the comfort of the people, is to *let them alone*.

FINIS.

In the Press, and in a few Days will be published,

PRICE SIXPENCE,

THE

FRIEND

OF THE

PEOPLE,

OR

CONSIDERATIONS, ADDRESSED

PRINCIPALLY TO

PERSONS OF SMALL INCOMES,

AND

MEMBERS OF FRIENDLY SOCIETIES,

RECOMMENDING THEM

TO ADOPT SOME MORE EFFECTUAL MEASURES FOR SECURING
THEIR OWN INDEPENDENCE,

*than those proposed to Parliament, by MR. WHITBREAD,
are calculated to promote.*

BY JOHN BONE,

*" Author of " The Wants of the People and the Means of the Government." " An
Outline of a Plan for Reducing the Poor's Rates." ... " The Principles and Regula-
tions of Tranquillity, &c" "*

*" It is in the power of the Government to prevent much evil ; it can do very
little positive good in this, or perhaps in anything else." ... BURKE ON SCARCITY.*

LONDON :

SOLD AT THE OFFICE OF TRANQUILLITY, ALBION STREET,
BLACKFRIARS' BRIDGE,
AND BY M. JONES, NO. 1, PATERNOSTER ROW.

TRANQUILLITY: AN INSTITUTION COMMENCED IN THE METROPOLIS AS AN ECONOMICAL BANK,

TO AFFORD

PERSONS of SMALL INCOMES

AN OPPORTUNITY of PROVIDING for their FUTURE WANTS,

By Payments suited to their Convenience.

PERSONS OF ALL AGES, TRADES, AND DESCRIPTIONS are invited to become MEMBERS of this INSTITUTION, which gives to the most trifling Subscriptions, advantages equal in proportion to those gained by the opulent upon large Sums.

• THE MEMBERS may accommodate the amount and time of every payment entirely to their own inclinations. Sums as small even as *Six-pence* will be received, and payments may be made as often as once a Week. There are NO FINES for omissions, should the subscriptions not be regularly continued; but ALL the sums subscribed, whether little or much, will be carefully preserved, and increased at *Compound Interest*, for the use of the Subscriber, and will be paid to him at the period of age, in a proportionate ANNUITY, for the REMAINDER of his LIFE.

BY THE PLAN OF THIS INSTITUTION,

MARRIED MEN are enabled to make provision for their WIDOWS, whilst the full benefits of their Subscriptions are secured to themselves in case they should survive their Wives:—

SINGLE WOMEN are enabled to make provision for themselves, of which, in case of marriage, their Husbands will be allowed to partake:—

CHILDREN and YOUTH may deposit their SMALL SAVINGS, to accumulate for their benefit on *entering* into life.

As THIS INSTITUTION has been commenced without any view to private emolument, the *full* advantages, whatever they may be, which result from its funds, must be divided amongst the MEMBERS, or their WIDOWS and CHILDREN; it is therefore needless to hold out any of those delusive promises, which none but the avaricious can desire, and none but the deluded can expect. The MEMBERS of this Institution will however enjoy the superior satisfaction of knowing, that they will not be exposed to any of those FORFEITURES, which frequently take the discontinued Subscription of a poor man, to swell the Annuities of those who have less need of it than himself.

FIVE highly respectable GENTLEMEN, wholly unconnected with the contrivance of the Plan, have consented to become the TRUSTEES of the Funds for the use of the Members; and all Monies received at the Office, are daily paid into the hands of the BANKERS to the Institution, MESSRS. HODSOLL and STIRLING, in the Strand.

THE OFFICE OF THE INSTITUTION is at No. 2, ALBION STREET, BLACK-FRIARS BRIDGE, where the Subscriptions of the Members are received, and where all Persons desirous of becoming Members of the Institution, or requiring further Particulars, are requested to apply.

The *Rules and Regulations* of the INSTITUTION may be had at the Office.

WILLIAM HONE, Secretary.

OFFICE of TRANQUILLITY.

THE FOLLOWING WORKS
ON THE
POOR LAWS, &c.

BY JOHN BONE,

Author of "The Wants of the People,"

May be had at the OFFICE of TRANQUILLITY, ALBION STREET, BLACK-FRIARS BRIDGE, of JORDAN and MAXWELL, No. 331, opposite Somerset-House, Strand, and of all other Booksellers.

I.

OUTLINE OF A PLAN FOR REDUCING THE POOR'S RATE, and amending the condition of the aged and unfortunate; including those of the Naval and Military Departments: In a Letter to the Right Hon. GEORGE ROSE, occasioned by his "Observations on the Poor Laws, &c." Price 2s.

II.

THE PRINCIPLES AND REGULATIONS OF TRANQUILLITY; an INSTITUTION commenced in the Metropolis, for encouraging and enabling industrious and prudent Individuals, in the various Classes of the Community, to provide for themselves, by the payment of small Weekly Sums, in such a way as shall secure to each Contributor, or to his Widow and Children, the Benefit of his own Economy;—for receiving the Savings of Youth of both Sexes, and returning the same at the time of Marriage, with Interest and proportionate Premiums thereupon;—for enabling Parents by the payment of small Sums at the Birth of their Children, to provide endowments for them at the Age of Twenty-one Years; and also, for other useful and important Purposes:—particularly for concentrating and applying the Exertions of the Liberal to the Benefit of the Indigent, so as to prevent the Unworthy claiming, or the Impostor abusing, their Benevolence; and thus effecting the Gradual Abolition of the Poor's Rate, whilst it Increases the Comforts of the Poor. Price 3s. 6d.

III.

THE RULES AND REGULATIONS OF AN INSTITUTION CALLED TRANQUILLITY; commenced in the Metropolis as an ECONOMICAL BANK, to afford Persons of all ages, trades, and descriptions, an opportunity of providing for their future wants by the Pay-

each Contributor, at the period of age, or to his Widow and Children, the Benefit of his own Economy: and also, for enabling Youth of both Sexes, to deposit their small Savings, to accumulate until the time of their respective Marriages, to be then returned to them, with Interest and proportionate Premiums, &c. &c. &c.

Office of the Institution, Albion Street, Black-friars Bridge.

"Of the Plan proposed by "the Principles and Regulations of Transmutability", so much, and, for the present only so much, is adopted, as persons of very little leisure can comprehend."

Price 3d. or 2s. 6d. per dozen, to give away.

THE FOLLOWING OPINIONS

have been already given respecting the INSTITUTION, of the Object and Principles of which, the PRECEDING WORKS are explanatory.

"Mr. BONE inclines to the opinion, that Poor Laws might be laid aside. His Plan merits diffusion. ***** There are other benevolent Plans in these pages which merit discussion."—ANNUAL REVIEW for 1805.

"After some very good observations on the radical Defects of the System adopted in this Country, for providing for the Wants of the Poor, the Author presents the outline of a new plan in a few propositions, which, as they may tend to the suggestion of useful ideas, we lay before our Readers ***** Several instructions and explanations are added.—The Public is highly indebted to every man who steps forward with his testimony against one of the destructive abuses of the present time, and with the offer of his honest ideas, for the rectification of a most disordered part of our police, teeming with innumerable mischiefs to the Nation."

LITERARY JOURNAL, 1805.

"The magnitude and importance of the Institution recommended by this Work, will render it necessary for us frequently to revert to its provisions. We shall now be content to notice the leading Features of the Plan. *** It was the opinion of Dr. Price, that "a Society or Office that would go on this Plan might do great service," as it would induce persons in the lower stations to adopt habits of industry in the beginning of life. Persons of any age may pay the smallest sums at the Office, either weekly or otherwise, as they may think proper. The ultimate Object of the Institution is, the *Abolition of the Poor's Rate*, which it proposes to effect *gradually*, by holding out inducements to the classes of Persons liable to become chargeable to the Parishes, to provide for their old age, by becoming Members of this Institution. We think the Plan well worthy the attention of our Readers."

MONTHLY REPOSITORY, August, 1806.

"The proposed Institution embraces a number of objects of considerable importance.—The POOR'S RATE we have long considered an evil of vast magnitude, and so rapid in its growth as absolutely to threaten the Country with ruin; any rational Plan therefore, proposed to effect its suppression, is entitled to the serious attention of every inhabitant of this kingdom. After an attentive perusal of the Plan here suggested, we have discovered nothing objectionable in it, and much indeed to recommend it, not only to notice but to adoption.—We heartily wish that all

the funds, of all the Benefit Societies in the metropolis and its vicinity were transferred to this Institution, from a conviction that they would be more faithfully administered, and rendered infinitely more productive to the members.*****It is but little to say in its favour, that it is much the best most comprehensive, and most rational Plan that we have seen, and we heartily wish it all possible success."

ANTI JACOBIN REVIEW, September, 1806.

"Amongst the numerous measures that have been, from time to time, adopted, with a design to improve the condition of the People, we are extremely happy to congratulate the Public on an Institution better calculated to combine and direct the united efforts of the whole population to this Object, than any Plan that has yet been proposed.—In this Plan we recognise a spirit of real liberality, which affords the Tradesman who can lay by ten Pounds per annum, and the Pedlar who can scarcely spare Sixpence per week, an equal opportunity of appropriating his means for his future benefit.—This Plan gives every Man an opportunity of preserving his independence; and if there should be some too indolent or too profligate to take advantage of the occasion, neither their indolence nor their profligacy will lessen the benefits to those who avail themselves of the means. The Institution cannot fail to meet with the approbation of all classes, and we hope that the intelligent and affluent will cheerfully render it any assistance that may be required, to secure its general adoption."

UNIVERSAL MAGAZINE, N. S. October, 1806.

"This Plan will shew what future benefits may accrue from the careful application of those small sums, which are frequently squandered away under the false notion, that they are too insignificant to be reserved for any better purpose.—We should not have noticed the Plan of this Institution, had it not involved some moral considerations of general importance. We hope that it will obtain attention from that part of the Public which is qualified to decide upon its utility."

ECLECTIC REVIEW, October, 1806.

"This Institution was noticed in our Magazine for August last; we then expressed our approbation of the Plan, and our hopes of its success. We feel a sensible pleasure in being able to state, as the result of our inquiries, that, if its progress has been apparently tardy, it has, at length been successful: The "Rules and Regulations" of the Institution have been issued from the Office in Albion Street, Black-friars Bridge, with a very forcible and suitable Address to the well disposed part of the Community. It is a striking feature of this Institution, that every Member is allowed to suit his own convenience in making his Payments, both as to the amount and time.—There are no Fines to harass, nor will any Sum, however trifling, be forfeited, which may have been once paid. Those who pay much will receive much; those who pay little will receive little. The omission of a Member punishes itself, for he cannot receive any advantage beyond what his own exertions have enabled him to provide. The Institution seems to say to each of its Members, in the language of Solomon, "If thou be wise, thou shalt be wise for thyself."

GOSPEL MAGAZINE, for January, 1807.

"At a moment when the attention of the Public is drawn to the subject, by the senatorial labours of Mr Whitbread, it may be proper to record, that an Institution has lately been formed, in Albion Street, Black-friars Bridge, called TRANQUILLITY, on the plan of an *Economical Bank*.*****From our knowledge of some of the Parties concerned in this Establishment, we are warranted in recommending it to the notice and

Of *Messrs. JORDAN and MAXWELL* may
likewise be had

I.

THE
WAR AS IT IS,

AND

THE WAR AS IT SHOULD BE:

An Address to the United Administration,

Urging the Necessity of a new Species of Warfare, and
a new Basis for a Treaty of Peace.

BY A TRUE ENGLISHMAN.

"It would be unjustifiable to go back to the records of other times, to
instruct us how to manage what they never enabled us to foresee."

BURKE.

Price One Shilling and Sixpence.

II.

THE MYSTERIES OF NEUTRALIZATION; or,
THE BRITISH NAVY VINDICATED FROM THE CHARGES
OF INJUSTICE AND OPPRESSION TOWARDS NEUTRAL
FLAGS. By JOHN BROWN, of Great Yarmouth.

"It is the violation of Maritime Neutrality alone which enables France
to prolong the contest. Tear up the fraudulent system of Neutraliza-
tion by the roots; and, if British commerce shall suffer a temporary di-
minution, the loss will be repaid an hundred fold by the total ruin of the
maritime power and commercial resources of the foe." Vide p. 4.

Price Four Shillings.

III.

FRANCE AND RUSSIA.

ADVANTAGES OF RUSSIA in the present Contest
with France; with a short Description of the Cossacs,

Price Two Shillings and Sixpence.

IV.

HISTORICAL REVIEW OF THE MORAL, RELI-
GIOUS LITERARY, AND POLITICAL CHARACTER
OF THE ENGLISH NATION, from the earliest Period.
By J. ANDREWS, L.L.D.

Price Seven Shillings, Boards.

V.

A Concise HEBREW and ENGLISH GRAMMAR,
with practical Rules, compiled from some of the most
considerable Hebrew Grammars, adapted to Bythner's
Lyta Prophetica, and complete Paradigms of the Hebrew
Verbs. Revised and Corrected by T. Yeate's, All Soul's
College, Oxford.

SIX LETTERS
TO THE
EDITOR OF THE MORNING POST.

Price 3s.

**Brettell & Co. Printers,
Marshall-Street, Golden-Square:**

SIX LETTERS
ON THE SUBJECT OF
DR. MILNER'S EXPLANATION
RELATING TO
THE PROPOSAL
MADE IN
THE LAST SESSION OF PARLIAMENT
FOR ADMITTING
THE KING'S VETO
IN THE
ELECTION OF
ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS.

ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING POST.
(AND FIRST PUBLISHED IN THAT PAPER.)

By A. B.

LONDON:
PRINTED FOR J. HATCHARD,
BOOKSELLER TO HER MAJESTY, OPPOSITE ALBANY,
FICCADILLY.

1809.

LETTERS

TO THE

EDITOR OF THE MORNING POST, &c.

LETTER I.

SIR,

THERE appeared, in the *Morning Chronicle* of the 19th of November, a Letter from the Roman Catholic bishop Dr. Milner, upon the subject of those declarations which were made in the last sessions of parliament, with regard to the dispositions of the Roman Catholics of Ireland to admit of his Majesty's *veto* in the future elections of their bishops. This Letter is so curious, as well as interesting, and is, also, upon so important a subject, that I cannot help submitting to your consideration, whether you would not do well to give it to your readers *.

* See the Letter in the Appendix, No. II, page xviii.

The letter to which I allude, becomes additionally interesting, at this time, when it is reported that the Roman Catholic Petition is again to be brought forward, in the next session of parliament; and when it is therefore evident that the subject of these declarations must necessarily come under discussion. For it must appear a most extraordinary circumstance, that, though these declarations were made, expressly in the name of the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland, and under the authority, as was supposed, and as was asserted, of Dr. Milner, their accredited agent and representative in England, yet they have been in substance disclaimed, and most publicly, and authoritatively disavowed, by those very bishops, as well as by that very accredited Agent and Representative himself.

Those noblemen and gentlemen who gave the parliament and the public to understand, that they were authorised to make these declarations, and who made them, for the direct and express purpose of influencing the decision of parliament, upon a great national question, must, undoubtedly, when the debates upon that question are renewed, if not before, feel it incumbent upon them to explain the part which they took in this transaction; and the public will be curious to hear, whether they will admit to Dr. Milner, that they stated, as under his

authority, much which they had no authority to state; ~~or~~ whether they will contend against him, that he now disclaims the authority which he then gave.

That the public were imposed upon, by these declarations, to believe, that there existed a temper and disposition in the Roman Catholic bishops, which unquestionably does not now exist, there can be no doubt. Who is to blame for this imposition, it is extremely difficult, on any view of the information at present before the public, to decide. If Dr. Milner's account is to be relied upon, the facts which are to be collected from his different letters, (for he has, fortunately for the public, written more letters than one upon this subject,) seem to be these.— That he certainly had some communications with the noblemen and gentlemen alluded to; that on these occasions he gave them to understand the *extent* to which *he conjectured* the Irish Roman Catholic prelates would not be unwilling to concede; that he expressly told them he had no instructions which would authorise him to *pledge* the consent of those prelates to any proposition; but that somehow or other, those noblemen and gentlemen did not accurately understand him, (or more correctly, that they completely and fundamentally misunderstood him,) both with respect to the authority

which he had to act for the Irish bishops, and also as to the nature and extent of the proposition to which, he *conjectured*, they might be disposed to accede: that from this it had followed, that these noblemen and gentlemen failed indeed in making an accurate representation of what they did not accurately understand; but that there is no ground whatever for imputing to any one of the parties any disengenuous intention to deceive the public or one another.

Such seems to be the view which Dr. Milner wishes to give of this transaction. If this should turn out to be the real state of the case, no small degree of blame would surely still attach to the noblemen and gentlemen concerned in it. For before they consented to act as the parliamentary spokesmen for the Roman Catholic bishops, it certainly became them to be well assured of the credentials of the person from whom they derived their authority; and also that the proposal which they made, was indeed that which they were authorised to make; and that they did not, from carelessness, or from any other cause, which they could, with reasonable precaution, have obviated, mislead the public upon so important a subject.

Such precaution was so obviously their duty, that, whatever respect may be due to Dr. Mil-

ner's authority, it is not just by his parliamentary friends, to give complete credit to him, without first hearing their story; especially as upon *one* of the two points on which he was misunderstood (I mean his instructions from Ireland), his statement would lead to the belief that he was so explicit, that it was next to impossible to misunderstand him: whilst upon the *other* (the nature and extent of the proposal itself), he will appear from one of his letters, to which I shall refer, to have been fully prepared to expect, that there might indeed be some intention of making some such proposal, as that which was made to parliament, but that he had so rooted and conscientious a conviction of its inadmissibility and unlawfulness, that he had come up to London *on purpose to oppose it*, if it should be brought forward; and that he would have been prepared, if necessary, to lay down his life in resisting it.—Now, that, in explaining himself upon so important a point, upon which he was so interested and anxious to avoid being misunderstood, He, acute, able, and intelligent, as he undoubtedly is, should have been so unfortunate, as to have explained himself in a manner, which led four such intelligent persons as Lord Grenville, Mr. Grattan, the Duke of Norfolk, and Mr. Ponsonby, not only not to understand him, but so totally to misunderstand

him, as to conceive that he was authorising them *to make the very proposition*, which he came up to town purposely *to oppose*—is a thing passing strange, and which requires no little stretch of confidence to believe. At all events it must be admitted, that it is so improbable, that it should not be believed on any authority, to the prejudice of these four statesmen, without first hearing what they have to say upon it.

Under these circumstances Dr. Milner cannot be surprised, if, notwithstanding his statement, the public should hesitate in ascribing the difference between him and his parliamentary advocates, to mistake alone.

Whether the Roman Catholics and their advocates have dealt quite fairly with one another, may indeed be doubted ; (this, however, is perhaps rather a matter for them to settle between themselves ;) but that by some amongst them, if not by all, the public have not been dealt fairly with, does on the face of the transaction appear to be more than probable ; and it will be established, beyond the possibility of doubt, in this and some future letters, which, if you think the subject of sufficient importance to find a place in your paper, shall be addressed to you.

If this imposition, which has been practised upon the public, had arisen out of a mere mistake, surely the persons who unintentionally

were parties to it, would have hastened to explain it. There has been abundant opportunity ; and it cannot be doubted that they owed it to their own characters, to one another, and to the public, to have avowed the mistake without delay, and to have corrected it. The backwardness which has been manifested in bringing forward any explanation, is of itself a circumstance which creates much suspicion. And the explanation, such as the public has it from Dr. Milner, if not at contradiction with itself, is so wholly unsatisfactory, that, till the subject is more cleared up, it is impossible not to suspect some of the parties in the transaction, to have been guilty of very unfair and disengenuous conduct.

How far the charge of backwardness in bringing forward any explanation is well founded, will best appear from a few dates and facts, which can admit of no doubt.

The declarations were first made in the House of Commons by Mr. Grattan and Mr. Ponsonby on the 25th of May ; they were referred to and repeated by Lord Grenville and the Duke of Norfolk in the House of Lords on the 27th ; yet the declaration of the Roman Catholic bishops, disavowing the sentiments which their parliamentary advocates had imputed to them, was not made till near four months afterwards,

viz. about the 16th of September. In the beginning of September, Dr. Milner *refused to give any explanation*, in the manner and for the reasons which shall presently be stated : and it was not till the 13th of November that the explanation, which is now under consideration, was obtained from him. There is, however, at length, *some* explanation obtained from *him* ; while to this very hour the other parties to this transaction, the other instruments of this public imposition — I mean the parliamentary proclaimers of these declarations—have, as far as they are concerned in this question, contentedly left the public in ignorance of the true state of it ; they have made no attempt to disabuse the public confidence, which, through their agency has been misled, or to vindicate the part which they, it is to be hoped unintentionally, have borne, in impressing this imposition upon the public mind.

How is all this to be accounted for? Must there not be something extremely inconvenient in explanation, when upon such a subject it has been delayed so long? Or can it be supposed, that all, or any, of these parties could be indifferent to the state of public opinion upon it, or insensible of the importance of explanation, both so far as respects the interests of that great question, on which they feel so much anxiety,

and so far as respects themselves also, whose credit, authority, and characters are involved in it?

Dr. Milner, when he wrote his letter for the *Morning Chronicle* on the 13th of November, seems to have written under the impression that explanation was necessary; and he seems desirous upon the occasion of giving this account at last to the public, to refer to some special circumstance which had just occurred, and which might appear to afford a reason for making his explanation public at that time, without impeaching the propriety of the conduct, which had been held by himself and others, in withholding an explanation upon the subject before. How far he is successful in this attempt, and how far the explanation itself is satisfactory, shall be the subject of my future letters.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient servant,

A. B.

LETTER II.

SIR,

IN pursuance of the intention, announced in my last letter, I proceed to resume the consideration of Dr. Milner's letter of the 18th of November. But as no small degree of suspicion attaches, not indeed to Dr. Milner alone, but generally to the parties concerned in the subject of that letter, from the manner in which they have delayed to give any explanation of their conduct, it will be of use, previous to an examination into the merits of the explanation itself, to endeavour to see how far Dr. Milner's former silence and conduct upon this subject, are consistent with the motives which appear to have influenced him upon the present occasion.

His motives for the present publication are best collected from his own words. He commences his letter to the Editor of the *Morning Chronicle** in the following manner:

“ It was not till within these four days that I met with your *Chronicles* of October the 15th and 17th; observing in these, and some other periodical publications, the manner in which my name is introduced, for the purpose of

aspersing some of the most distinguished and honourable characters in the United Parliament, as if they had proposed a plan for a certain restricted interference of the crown in the nomination of the Catholic prelates of Ireland, without any warrant for this purpose; and that my sentiments on this subject expressed on one occasion, are quoted in opposition to those which I have expressed on another occasion; I think myself called upon to vindicate those personages, and to do justice to myself before the public; which, with your permission, I will attempt in your Chronicle. The public will not be averse from hearing me upon a subject on which it has repeatedly called for information."

It appears, therefore, that his publishing this explanation at this time, or at all, arose from his having observed two passages in the *Morning Chronicle*, which, it seems, had escaped his notice for near a month after the greatest part of the public, and especially of his political friends, the readers of that paper, must have been in possession of them. From these passages, and from other publications, he perceived that his own consistency was attacked, and that his name was made the means of aspersing his most distinguished parliamentary partisans; and therefore, within four days from meeting with these papers, he publishes, from Wolverhampton, the

explanation of what really passed between him and these most distinguished and honourable characters.

If these passages in the *Morning Chronicle* had afforded him the first intimation of the anxious curiosity of the public upon this subject, it would not have been surprising that he should thus have hastened to gratify it. But he tells us, in the very passage above quoted, that the public had *repeatedly called* for this information. The anxiety, especially of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, to obtain it, could not have been unknown to him. The declaration of the public synod of their prelates, that they thought it inexpedient to accede to any alteration in the mode of their episcopal appointment, must have been known to him, their accredited agent. Distinct questions had been put to him, in letters published in the *Dublin Herald*, under the signatures of *Laicus* and *Sarsfield*, concerning his late communication with their parliamentary advocates.—But to these questions he refused to answer; nay, in a letter of the 8th of September, dated from Cork, and addressed to the Editor of the *Dublin Herald*, he declines answering these enquiries, because he thinks it would be indecorous to his parliamentary advocates to explain these points, without their consent. I will not, however, trust myself with

reporting his reasons, except in his own words; they are as follows * :—

“ I have always understood that it is highly indecorous to commit to the press, any account of a conversation held with another gentleman, concerning business of importance, without the revision or consent, of that gentleman; certain it is, that I have lately experienced such to be the sense of the higher ranks of society, in an instance relative to the matter in question; now it is not in my power to communicate at all with all the illustrious personages alluded to at the present time; and I have great doubt whether, at any future time, I could obtain their consent to the desired publication.”

It seems, therefore, that on the 8th of September, he could not commit to the press, or, in other words, could not give to the public, an account of this matter, because he had not the authority of his parliamentary advocates, and that it would be indecorous in him to do so, without their leave, and without their previous revision of the account which he was to give.

.. What are we to conclude then, Mr. Editor, upon our receiving at last this explanation from Dr. Milner? Has he been guilty of the indecorum of publishing it without the consent, and without the revision, of his parliamentary ad-

*. See Appendix, No. III, page xxxi.

vocates? Or has he been fortunate enough, in his residence at Wolverhampton, within the short period of those four days, which elapsed between the time of his seeing the passages in the *Morning Chronicle*, and the date of his own letter, to procure, not only the *consent* of the several noblemen and gentlemen, with whom he had the conversation, that his account of it should be published, but also their *revision* of that account? A consent, and a revision, which, it must be remembered, at the date of his letter from Cork, he felt to be necessary, previous to his publication; but which, he said, he could not then procure, and doubted whether he ever should be able to obtain.

It would be by no means immaterial to ascertain this point, if it were possible. For the document would, unquestionably, become infinitely more important and authentic, if we were at liberty to understand, that it was given to the public with the consent, and after the revision of his parliamentary advocates. It would then be to be received, and might be argued upon, as containing the case, not only of Dr. Milner, but also of his parliamentary advocates; as the common and *joint* defence of both parties. But, though it may seem to be doing him injustice to conclude, without farther proof, that he had not procured all their *consents*, before he published his letter, (since he so very lately had ex-

pressed his strong sense of the impropriety of such a publication without procuring them,) yet, it would be a similar injustice to these noblemen and gentlemen to consider them, without further proof, to be privy to this statement, consenting to its publication, and acquiescing in its accuracy; especially when there seems so much reason to doubt the fact of their being in any way parties to its publication. For, in the first place, it is not easy to conceive how such consents could have been procured, within that short space of four days, which elapsed between his meeting with the passages in the *Morning Chronicle*, which provoked him to publish, and the date of the publication itself. But, besides this, it is more candid to believe, as it is surely more probable (provided the account Dr. Milner has given of what passed is the true one), that he should, after a little reflection (notwithstanding his expression in his letter from Cork), have changed his opinion, and have ceased to entertain any apprehension that there would be the least indecorum, under the circumstances in which the account was called for, in giving it to the public without waiting for any consent at all. Nay, indeed, Dr. Milner must pardon any one, who may feel great difficulty in believing, that his reason, so given in his letter from Cork, for refusing to afford the explana-

tion which was asked of him, could, at any time, have appeared to him to have the weight which he there ascribes to it, or that it could have been the real reason which influenced him in determining to withhold it.

For what was the case? Dr. Milner, the accredited agent of the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland, finds, that his name and his authority had been used to convey to the public a false opinion, injurious, according to his present statement, to his character for Roman Catholic orthodoxy, and injurious also to the orthodoxy of his constituents, the Roman Catholic prelates; and that this false opinion had prevailed, because the distinguished and honourable public characters, with whom he had communicated, upon an important public question, had misunderstood, and consequently misrepresented the effect of his communication. Is it then possible to believe, that Dr. Milner should really think, that he could not, without doing something extremely indecorous towards those gentlemen, set himself and those Roman Catholic bishops right, by committing the true state of the facts to the press, unless he had the consent of those illustrious and honourable characters? Or that he could seriously doubt, whether he ever could procure their consent? What idea must he entertain of their honour and of their justice, if he

forms this strange opinion of them? The conversation which he represents as so confidential, was evidently held, for the express purpose of having the result of it communicated to the public;—these gentlemen had given to the public their statement of it;—that statement was false: and Dr. Milner could not, without indecorum, communicate a true one! A sense of honour, truly, towards those, who had misrepresented him, in a matter so important to his character, and to that of his reverend constituents—so essential, as he says, to the interests of the Roman Catholic religion—was to oblige him to remain under the effect of such misrepresentation, under the imputation of having authorised a proposition which (as we shall see presently by another of his letters), he had rather die than consent to!

If the matter rested here, would it not be difficult to suppose that Dr. Milner, with his experience of the world, could really entertain so strange an opinion, as that any man's consent could be necessary to justify the publication of such a conversation, especially, when it became so essential for his own justification? or, that, with his high estimation of the honour of these distinguished characters, he could believe them capable of harbouring so unjust a wish, as to be desirous of withholding their consent from

his publishing that, which every principle of fairness, candour, and justice, would have made them anxious that he should have the opportunity to promulgate? But it does not rest here. For the account of this conversation, which he could not, without violating all decorum, commit to the press in September, it appears, by his letter to the *Morning Chronicle*, he had committed to the press on the 26th of May. We have his own words for it:

“ There are copies of a short printed paper, composed by me, and dated May 26, 1808, in the hands of different gentlemen, which will shew that I have not materially varied in the present exposition, from that which I made at the time of the debates.”

It may be said, perhaps, that this printed paper was prepared for private use only, and that though such printing was, literally speaking, committing to the press, yet it was not so, in the sense in which that expression is used in the letter of the 8th of September from Cork, viz. as equivalent to publishing. The paper, however, it seems, was not only printed, but in the hands of “ *different gentlemen*,” not described as the noblemen and gentlemen with whom the conversation passed, but several gentlemen. Now, though the indecorum might not be so great in its degree, it is certainly equally great

in its principle, to communicate a confidential conversation to a *few* as to *many*. But (what is still more extraordinary than all this) although in his letter from Cork, of the 8th September, he says, it would be indecorous to give the account, without the consent of those, whose consent he doubted whether he should ever be able to obtain, yet, in point of fact, he had on the 1st of August preceding, given the account in a letter from Wolverhampton, to a parish priest in Ireland. This letter has since been published, though not, as it should seem, with Dr. Milner's authority, in the *Dublin Herald* of September the 21st, and 28th, and of October the 10th.

The conversation, therefore, which was so private and confidential, that it would have been indecorous for Dr. Milner to publish it in September, he had printed, and, in a circle more or less extensive, had circulated on the 26th of May;—he had also given an account of it in his letter to a parish priest of the 1st of August from Wolverhampton; and he now gives it to the public through the *Morning Chronicle*, in a letter of the 13th of November. May not, therefore, all this justify a little hesitation in believing, that the fear of violating the decorum of private confidence was the true reason for declining to give the account which was required of him in September.

Two other passages from his letter to the *Morning Chronicle* should here be adverted to; they are these:

“ It is very possible that some of the personages whom I had the honour then of communicating with, may not have fully comprehended my meaning, and I have reason to suppose that the concessions, as they are here stated, in this exposure, fall short of the idea which the public formed of them, as first laid down.”

If, then, he has reason so to suppose, how can he possibly reconcile to common justice, either towards the Roman Catholics, or the Protestant public, to have delayed the exposure so long? With these observations I conclude this part of the subject, in perfect conviction, that any person who has taken the trouble of wading through this long letter, must be satisfied, whatever opinion he may form upon Dr. Milner's explanation (the merits of which I will canvas in my next), that the delay, which has attended the publication of that explanation, remains most unsatisfactorily accounted for.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

A. B.

LETTER III.

SIR,

It must undoubtedly be admitted, that, provided the explanation itself be satisfactory at last, it matters, comparatively speaking, but little, how long it has been delayed ; and indeed, what has been said in the last letter, should not be understood as intended to urge the delay as a substantive offence ; but to urge it, and remark upon it, only, as affording strong ground of suspicion, if not of proof, that there is something extremely difficult and awkward in the way of explanation ; that it is to such difficulty that the delay is to be ascribed ; and that consequently when the explanation itself is examined, prudence requires that it should be received with considerable caution and jealousy.

It now remains to be shewn, that the explanation itself (as the presumption arising from this delay would lead one to expect) does prove most unsatisfactory ; and so far from its being any longer matter of surprise, that it should have been so much delayed, the surprise will rather be, that, if the truth could afford no better means of explanation, any Explanation should have been attempted at all.

Dr. Milner had, it must be admitted, a very difficult task to execute. He had written a letter to a parish priest, which is dated from Wolverhampton, the 1st of August 1808*. In that letter, after remarking that he had not been the first to introduce this delicate subject of the King's interference, in the election of their bishops, and after mentioning various publications, in which the opinion, in favour of such interference, had been encouraged, as he says, to a very mischievous effect—he adds, “I mention these circumstances, not by way of intimating any acquiescence in the measure.—The measure taken, as it was proposed,” (not observe, as the papers had misrepresented the parliamentary speeches, but “*as it was proposed,*”) “I know to be unlawful, and schismatical. So far, indeed, from acquiescing in it, I wrote most pressingly, during the last spring, to two of your venerable metropolitans, in order to consult with them, on the best mode of defeating it; and it is a fact, which I declare upon my conscience, *that my chief motive for going up to London about ten weeks ago,*” (the letter being dated on the 1st of August, ten weeks before, will carry us back to a few days before the debates, in which these declarations were made,) “*was to oppose the measure,*

had it been brought forward in parliament, as I was fearful would be the case; being deeply conscious that it was my duty to do so at the expence of my life." And in another letter from Dr. Milner, dated from Cork, on the 8th of September, and addressed to the Editor of the *Dublin Herald*,* there are these words, "I may add in justice to them," (the parliamentary advocates,) "as well as to myself, that after the debate was over, they acknowledged themselves to have advanced certain positions, the most alarming of all that were made, *for which they had no warrant, but their own way of viewing the subject.*"

Having such an opinion of the measure which was proposed, and recollecting this acknowledgement of his parliamentary advocates, namely, that they had advanced, as from his authority, that for which they had no warrant but from their own view of the subject; and having written letters which were before the public, in which this opinion and this acknowledgement were asserted; it must be admitted that Dr. Milner undertook no very easy task in his letter to the *Morning Chronicle*, viz. "at once to vindicate his own consistency," and "to rescue his parliamentary advocates from the aspersions which have been cast upon them, as if they had

* See Appendix, No. III.

proposed a plan for a certain restricted interference of the crown, on the nomination of the Catholic prelates, without any warrant for this purpose." For if the proposal, which was made, was brought forward, by those who made it, as under the warrant of Dr. Milner's authority, and if that proposal was so unlawful and schismatical, that it was his duty to oppose it at the expence of his life, it seems to follow, to a common understanding at least, either that Dr. Milner had given his authority to this unlawful and schismatical proposal, or that those who made it, had brought it forward without that warrant or authority which they pretended. And again, if they brought it forward, asserting that they acted under his authority, (and he says, in the letter in the *Dublin Herald*, that they acknowledged, that, as to the most alarming points, they acted *without* his authority, and upon their own view of the subject,) either they must wilfully and knowingly, have asserted to parliament that which was not true, and which they have since acknowledged to be otherwise than as they asserted it; or Dr. Milner grossly slanders them in this letter of his to the Editor of the *Dublin Herald*. Thus the matter seems to stand between Dr. Milner and his friends: either they have falsely assumed Dr. Milner's authority, or he has falsely denied an authority

which he gave ; and the more Dr. Milner's letters are examined, the more I am confident this will appear. He, therefore, and his illustrious and distinguished friends, have to settle between them, which of these alternatives are to be adopted ; and Dr. Milner, whose letter is written " at once to defend his own consistency, and to vindicate his parliamentary advocates from the foul charge which has been brought against them," as he says, " by their political adversaries," has a task of difficulty, which even the acknowledged ability and adroitness of Dr. Milner himself will certainly be found unequal to accomplish. This will be clearly evinced by an examination of the five following questions :—

First, Whether these parliamentary advocates did tender any proposition, as under the authority of Dr. Milner, from the Roman Catholic bishops? and if they did,

Then Secondly, Whether they had any right to tender *any* proposition as under *any* warrant from Dr. Milner?

Thirdly, Whether, if they had *any* warrant to tender *any* proposition, they did tender it under the sort of warrant which he gave them?

Fourthly, Whether Dr. Milner himself had any authority from the Irish prelates? and,

Fifthly, Whether the proposition itself, which they did tender, was that which he had authorised them to make?

In examining these questions, the first thing to be done is to advert to Dr. Milner's own testimony.

In stating what passed, upon being summoned and interrogated by some of the leading members, he expresses himself thus in his Letter to the *Morning Chronicle* :

“ My answer in the different communications I had upon this subject, was to the following effect:— That I had no *specific* instructions on the subject;” (In his Letter to the parish priest of the 11th of August, before referred to, his words are, “ *My answer on the different occasions alluded to, was uniformly, that I had no instructions from the Irish prelates on the subject proposed*”), “ and that there was no time previous to the expected debate for obtaining any instructions from Ireland; that I knew full well, the Catholic bishops could not give to his Majesty, nor he, as Head of the Established Church, receive a right of patronage, or any other positive powers in this concern, as that would be an incontestible pledge and act of *mutual religious communion*; nevertheless, that I had very ~~good~~ reason to believe

the Catholic bishops of Ireland would not be averse *under certain circumstances*," (what circumstances? were they specified?) "and as part of a general arrangement, from conceding to the Crown a certain negative power or veto, such as would, in my opinion, afford the desired pledge. *Provided always* that the power were limited within *the bounds necessary for the safety* as well as *for the independency* of the Church." (Were these bounds specified, or who was to be the judge of what was necessary for that object?) "and, *in such* manner as to prevent the *negative power* from becoming a *positive power*," (was this manner specified, and what was it?) "and from being otherwise abused for the oppression, corruption, or detriment of our religion."—He then proceeds:—

"Whoever duly weighs this statement, sees that our parliamentary advocates were warranted in the declarations which they made in parliament; *to the extent and in the manner here set down*; and it is my duty thus publicly to avow the share which I took in the *warrant* under which they spoke of the *presumed disposition* of the Irish prelates;" (a curious *warrant* this, the warrant of a *presumed disposition*!) "to make the desired *concessions*.—On the other hand, he will see that I did not hold out any

the most distant prospect of these prelates yielding to the Crown, any degree of ecclesiastical supremacy, or actual power, direct or indirect, over the Catholic Church in Ireland. In short, he will acquit the honorable personages alluded to of the foul fraud imputed to them by their political adversaries, and he will acquit me also of the inconsistencies with which I have been charged in the newspapers with respect to my declarations and writings upon different occasions."

Surely Dr. Milner runs here too fast to his conclusions. Whoever, indeed, duly weighs Dr. Milner's statement, if it can really be supposed to contain any thing like an accurate account of what passed, will acquit these honorable and noble persons of any fault, and their understandings of any defect of comprehension, if they did not correctly understand what Dr. Milner meant, and if they did not collect any accurate and precise idea, from a statement so studiously obscure, and so elaborately equivocal and indefinite. But how they can be acquitted of folly and credulity in the extreme, in pledging themselves, in parliament, to any thing whatever, upon the sanction of such a statement as the Doctor's; how they could fail suspecting that deception might, by

possibility at least, lurk in these *generalities*, even if it were not intended to be disguised by them, is more than can easily be conceived.

Dr. Milner says "it will appear they *were warranted* in the declarations they made in parliament, *to the extent, and in the manner here set down.*"—Now does Dr. Milner (ay or no?) mean to assert or insinuate, that the declarations which his parliamentary advocates made in parliament *were ONLY to the extent and in the manner here set down?*" If he *does* mean to assert or insinuate this, where was his sincerity when in writing to the parish priest in August last, he said that "the measure taken as it was proposed, **HE KNEW TO BE UNLAWFUL AND SCHISMATICAL**, or when he said in his other Letter from Cork, that his parliamentary friends had acknowledged that they *had advanced*, the *most alarming* propositions, *without any warrant*;" or if he does *not* mean this—where is his sincerity now, when he endeavours to frame a defence, for his parliamentary friends, by saying, "it will appear that they *were warranted* in the declarations they *made*, to the extent and in the manner here set down," when in fact they made them to *an extent and in a manner far different*; and when all that the truth would have justified him in stating was, "that it will appear they *would* **HAVE BEEN WARRANTED** if they had

made their declarations to this extent, and in this manner only, but that from some cause or other, they *did make* them to a *much greater* extent, and therefore they were not warranted. Is it possible for any degree of candour to see this miserable quibble, this shuffle of language, in any other light than as a disingenuous (I had almost said Jesuitical) attempt to impose upon a careless reader, to believe, that they *had a warrant* for what they *did do*, while he reserves for himself the means of shewing that his words, upon a critical examination of the passage, do not convey any such sense? If there ever was an instance of keeping the word of truth to the ear; and denying it to the sense, this passage exhibits it.

These observations, which I could not resist from making, while the passages of the Doctor's letter were immediately before me, have diverted me from the order on which I intended to observe upon it; and have proved of such a length as to render it necessary to bring this Letter to a close.

I am, Sir,

your obedient Servant,

A. B.

LETTER IV.

SIR,

THE two first questions which I proposed in my last Letter to examine were—1st. Whether Dr. Milner's parliamentary advocates did tender *any* proposition, as under the authority of Dr. Milner, from the Irish Roman Catholic bishops? and, 2dly, if they did, whether they had any right to tender *any* proposition, as under *any* warrant from him? Upon these two questions there can be no rational doubt. Dr. Milner's own statement proves that they did tender *some* proposition as under his warrant, and that he had given them *some* warrant to tender it. He admits, nay, he contends, as we have seen before, that, from his own statement, it appears that they were *warranted* in making the declarations which they made “to the extent, and in the manner there laid down.”

But on the third question, namely, whether they did tender the proposition under the sort of warrant which he gave them, Dr. Milner says in *one* letter, that he distinctly stated to

them that he had *no* instructions; and in *another*, that he had no *specific* instructions from the Irish prelates to that purpose. But still he admits, that these members of parliament did make *some* statement; and that he did give them *some* warrant; though he afterwards calls it "the *warrant of a presumed disposition*." If any one should not precisely understand what this expression means, he may find his excuse in the singularity of it; but I suppose the meaning to be, the *warrant* of Dr. Milner's *conjecture* of what he *presumed* was or would be the *disposition* of the Irish Roman Catholic bishops. If therefore instead of stating the proposition as upon a *conjecture* and *presumption* of Dr. Milner, his parliamentary advocates stated it as from the authority of the bishops themselves, communicated by Dr. Milner; they must, I apprehend, according to Dr. Milner's meaning, (though I confess it is rather difficult to understand exactly what his meaning is,) fall, justly, under the very censure, from which, it was his professed purpose, to defend them.

With respect to the real state of this fact, viz. the degree of authority, which they professed to act under, and the nature of the warrant which they represented Dr. Milner to have given them, it is difficult undoubtedly to ascertain it with precision, as there is no record of

what is stated in a debate in either House of parliament ; and a general reference to what the public impression was upon the occasion, is too loose to be satisfactory.†

But upon reference to such impression, every man who read the newspapers at the time, or who had opportunity of access to members of parliament, must recollect, that it was universally understood to have been a proposition made upon the authority of Dr. Milner, in the name of the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland. Upon referring to such reports as Mr. Cobbett furnishes to the public, (and his Report is much fuller than any other which I have seen of these Debates,) it will appear (vol. XI. p. 556,)* that Mr. Grattan, in introducing this proposition, is made so say,

“ I have a proposition to make, a proposition which the Catholics have *authorised* me indeed to name.”

Sir J. Cox Hipplesley (ibid, p. 597,) says, that

“ This proposition had been introduced *under the authority* of Dr. Milner,” whom he describes as “ himself a prelate of the Roman Catholic communion, and who *was formally accredited to this country by these prelates as the organ of their sentiments, to treat in their behalf, if any such treaty became necessary,*

* See Appendix, No. V.

and to propose or assent to such measures as might eventually be connected with the objects of the present discussion ;" and Mr. Ponsonby having stated his view of the proposition in his original speech, was called upon by Mr. Yorke to explain by what authority he had made it : and, in page 619, of the same book, he is made to answer, that he made the statement " upon the authority of Dr. Milner, who " was a Roman Catholic bishop, in this country, and who *was authorised by the Catholic bishops of Ireland to make the proposition in " case the measure of Roman Catholic Emancipation should be acceded to.*"

Lord Grenville's expressions are (ibid, p. 649 :) " It is unquestionably proper that the crown should exercise an effectual negative over the appointment of the persons called to execute those (the episcopal) functions ; *to this the Catholics of Ireland* DECLARE themselves perfectly willing to accede." And in his reply (p. 649,) the proposition relative to the future appointment of Catholic bishops in Ireland, " was, to his knowledge, long in contemplation, although the *Catholics had not until lately thought proper to make it public.*"

Let the reader now recollect Dr. Milner's statement, that he told all these parliamentary advocates of his, " that he had *no specific in-*

structions from the Roman Catholic bishops, and that they only spoke under the warrant of the *presumed dispositions of the Irish prelates* ;” and then let him determine whether what Mr. Grattan said of the “ *proposition which he was authorised to name*,”—Sir J. Cox Hipplesey, of “ *the accredited authority of Dr. Milner, under whose authority the proposition was introduced*,”—Mr. Ponsonby, of “ *the proposition which Dr. Milner was authorised to make* ;—as well as the effect of Lord Grenville’s expressions ;—and then, let him determine whether these declarations were consistent with a due and just execution only of what Dr. Milner can, by possibility, mean by his “ *warrant of a presumed disposition*,” under which alone, according to him, they were authorised to state any thing ; and surely he will have no difficulty in perceiving, that Dr. Milner, and his parliamentary advocates, are directly and flatly at issue and contradiction with each other upon this point ;—namely, the nature and extent of the warrant under which they were authorised to submit the proposition to parliament. But this is far from all. For, if it be clear that these two parties, whom it was the object of Dr. Milner’s Letter to the *Morning Chronicle* to reconcile, are at great variance, with respect to the nature and extent of *the warrant* under which the proposi-

tion was made, it will be found to be still infinitely clearer, that they vary, almost diametrically, as to the nature and extent of the *proposition* itself, which, under any warrant, (be it of express authority, or of presumed disposition,) they undertook, in the face of parliament, and of the nation, to tender in the name of the Irish bishops.

But, before I proceed to the examination of that question, there is another of some curiosity at least, if not of use, which I proposed to consider: I mean the question, Whether, in point of fact, Dr. Milner had *any* instructions or authority, from the Roman Catholic prelates, to make *any* proposal at all.

This is a question which it would be idle to lose much time in discussing; especially as it is one on which it would be extremely difficult to come to any satisfactory conclusion. If there were no other letter from Dr. Milner upon this subject than that which is published in the *Morning Chronicle*, the necessary conclusion would be, that he had *some general*, but *no specific* instructions. But comparing this with the letter from Wolverhampton to the parish priest, it will appear that Dr. Milner states the matter differently. In the last mentioned letter, he says, "that he *uniformly* told his friends he had *no* instructions on the subject proposed;" in the other, he says, he told them, "he had no

specific instructions on this subject." How it happens that his two accounts of what he told them vary in this degree, Dr. Milner alone can explain. The statement that he had no *specific* instructions, would naturally imply that he had some general instructions; and if he had *any* instructions, however general and unspecific, how happened it that (as his letter from Cork expresses it) he did say, and that *uniformly*, that he had *none*? If again he really had *none*, how happened it, that his expression in his other letter is, that he had no *specific* instructions? it would be *literally true*, indeed, if he had *no* instructions, that he had no *specific* instructions; because if he had *none at all of any description*, he could have none that were *specific*; the epithet, therefore, would introduce no *express* falsehood. But, would it not imply, to those who heard it used, that he had some general instructions upon the subject? and thus, by inducing those to whom he used it, to think he had some instructions, give to his communication an apparent weight and sanction, which, upon that subject, ought not to have belonged to it? And if it were not for this positive assertion in his letter from Cork, that he uniformly told his parliamentary friends, that he had no instructions, the inference strongly to be drawn, not only from this expression, but also from other circumstances, would be, ~~that~~ he had *some*.

In his letter from Cork, above referred to, as a reason for withholding an answer to the questions which had been put to him in the *Dublin Evening Herald*, in addition to that already noticed of the indecorum of publishing a confidential conversation, he says, "It would evidently be still more indecorous, it would even be a crime too bad to be named, to betray the confidence of the venerable prelates, whose business I so lately transacted. Laicus complains, that they themselves have thought proper to keep him in the dark with respect to it, and he applies to me, their confidential agent, to inform him of it."—If Dr. Milner had no instructions from his constituents upon this subject, where would be the crime, when he found much prejudice excited against them in the minds of their Roman Catholic flock, on account of the instructions which they were supposed to have given, to have stated that they had really given him none? If, indeed, they had given him any, it might be to betray them inconveniently enough, had he disclosed the fact, when they wished it to be concealed. But, unless he had some instructions from them, upon this point, which, under present circumstances at least, they do not feel it convenient to have disclosed, it is difficult to conceive how he could have been misled into the idea that it would be a crime to tell the world, not what his instructions were, nor even

what they were not, but merely and solely that he had *no instructions at all*; and that, consequently, whatever he had said in conversation, whether more or less consistent with what might have been expected from him, and whether rightly or wrongly understood and represented by those to whom he had addressed it, had nothing in the remotest degree to do with any instruction from the Roman Catholic bishops; and that no possible responsibility, therefore, could attach upon them on account of it. Could such a statement betray any confidence, or constitute any crime? nay, does it not seem that fairness and justice towards his constituents, would, under such circumstances, have imperiously required it of him?

Besides this, the conduct of the Roman Catholic bishops themselves seems to afford reason to conclude, that they had given some instructions or authority to Dr. Milner upon this subject. For what do they do? They find a strong impression made in the minds of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, in consequence of this proposal. In the language, which Dr. Milner, in his letter to the *Morning Chronicle*, puts into the mouths of some of them, "We find (he makes them say), that a vast majority of our people is decidedly against the concession, even insomuch that we should lose their confidence

and our influence over them were we at present to sanction it." Under this impression, at a synod, held by them in Dublin, on the 14th and 15th of September, they declare, that "it is the decided opinion of the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland, that *it is inexpedient* to make any alteration in the common mode hitherto observed in the nomination of Irish Roman Catholic bishops; which mode long experience has proved to be unexceptionable, wise, and salutary.*" Now, can it possibly be supposed, that if, when they were assembled and were considering the effect of those declarations in parliament;—when they were impressed with a strong sense of the decided disapprobation of a vast majority of their people to this concession;—when they were desirous of recovering the confidence and preserving the influence which they might fear to lose, in consequence of the proposal, can it possibly be supposed, that if they had given *no authority, or no instructions specific or general*, that they would not have availed themselves of such an opportunity of declaring that fact? one simple declaration to that effect, would not only have restored to them the confidence of their flock, but it would have proved that they had never done any thing upon the subject for a moment to lose or to shake it. And when, instead of

* See Appendix, No. IV.

this they content themselves with barely stating that it is "inexpedient" in language, which Dr. Milner thinks justifies him in arguing, that it is an inexpediency "which depends upon existing circumstances, and which obviously may vary"—the inference surely is that they could not in truth and honour deny the fact, that they had given some authority. Such certainly would at least be the inference which I should have drawn from this circumstance, if it had not been for Dr. Milner's declaration in his Letter to the Parish Priest, that he had *uniformly* declared that he had *no* instructions from them *whatever* upon that subject. As it is, however, there are difficulties both ways; and this question must, as far as depends upon any materials which are to my knowledge at present before the public, remain involved in some degree of uncertainty. I am aware, that to many readers it may seem a matter of very inconsiderable importance, whether this difficulty should ever be removed; but, on the other hand, I am confident, that to others it will appear to be a question affecting in no slight degree the good faith and sincerity of the transaction itself, as well as the consistency of the account which Dr. Milner has given of it.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

A. B.

LETTER V.

SIR,

HAVING endeavoured to shew in my former letters, that a proposition was made, by the parliamentary advocates of the Roman Catholics, in the name of the Roman Catholic bishops of Ireland, under the asserted authority of Dr. Milner ; that it was made under the assertion of a degree of warrant or authority, which Dr. Milner now says he never gave ; and having further shewn in my last letter, the difficulty that there is in ascertaining whether those bishops had really given Dr. Milner any authority at all : I now proceed to the last question which I proposed to consider, namely, whether the proposition which was so made (under whatever degree of warrant or authority), was, or was not conformable to that which Dr. Milner had authorised his parliamentary friends to make ?

I shall here again begin with endeavouring to understand, from Dr. Milner's statements, what the proposition was which he had given his parliamentary friends reason to believe, would meet with the concurrence of the Irish bishops ; and

I shall then compare it with the proposition, as it was really stated, according to the best account which can be procured.

Dr. Milner's own words in his letter in the *Morning Chronicle* on this point, are as follows :—

“ That I know full well the Catholic bishops could not give to his Majesty, nor he as head of the Established Church receive, a right of patronage, or any other positive power in this concern, as this would be an incontestible pledge, and act of mutual religious communion; nevertheless, I had very good reason to believe the Catholic bishops in Ireland would not be averse, under CERTAIN *circumstances*, and as a part of a general arrangement, from conceding to the crown, a certain negative power or veto, such as would, in my opinion, afford the desired pledge, provided that this power were limited within the bounds necessary for the safety, as well as the independency, of our Church; and in such manner as to prevent the negative power from becoming a positive power, or from being otherwise abused for the oppression, corruption, or detriment of our religion.”

The questions which occur to be asked upon this statement, are, what these limitations were to be? and whether, whatever they were, they were specified by Dr. Milner to his parliamen-

tary advocates, and acceded to by them? and if so, whether they were stated by them to parliament?

To some of these questions, at least, an answer can in part be supplied by a reference to Dr. Milner's other letters. In his letter from Wolverhampton, to the parish priest, which has been before referred to, the account given of the conversation with his parliamentary friends is in these words :

“ I said, however, that I had good reason to believe, that they (the Roman Catholic bishops) never would consent to attribute any positive power to the crown, not even so far as to its selecting one candidate out of three of the prelates' own proposing; nevertheless *that in case there was to be a friendly ministry*, and that the emancipation were to take place, I thought they would not be averse to consult his Majesty's ministers, after they had themselves chosen, in the usual way, the person fittest to be presented to the Pontiff; in order to ascertain whether those ministers entertained any suspicion of the purity of this person's civil and political conduct and principles, which is in fact to ascribe a negative power and interference in this transaction. I added, however, that they would not, according to my notions, allow the crown an unrestrained negative power, as this

might be made to operate like a positive power, and open a door to intrigue and ambition; but they would wish to restrain the negative power, or veto, to a reasonable number of times. *I did not understand*, as it has been objected to me, an *indefinite number of times*, to be left open for contention between the ministry and the prelates, as the case should occur; but a definite number, whether *twice, thrice, or four* times, to be settled by the latter, whenever the proposed treaty should be actually concluded." (And in the postscript to that letter,) "I must add here, that in my communication with certain members of the legislature, *equally powerful and friendly*, I contended so strongly and so repeatedly, for even the negative power being restricted to a certain number of times, to be *afterwards determined by the prelates THEMSELVES*," (for on this delicate point I would not so much as hazard an opinion,) "that I conceived myself to run the greatest risk of *losing their friendship*."

And in his letter from Cork to the Editor of the *Dublin Herald*, after stating the manner in which he thought there could be no objection to the King's exercising his negative upon the three first candidates who might be proposed, upon the supposition that all three might be rejected, he says, "*Here I conceive its negative*

power MUST NECESSARILY end; for, I repeat it, I would rather lose my life than consent to an uncatholic government's obtaining any actual power, or such a negative power as might grow into an actual power."

Taking therefore those two last mentioned letters, as explanatory of that which Dr. Milner wrote to the *Morning Chronicle*, it appears, that the circumstances, under which Dr. Milner said, the bishops would, in his opinion, concede, were—the case of the Emancipation taking place, *and the existence of a friendly ministry*. And the limitation which was to prevent the negative from going into a positive was —*that the negative power was to be restricted to a certain number of times*. And the necessity of this limitation was so strongly, and so repeatedly, contended for by Dr. Milner, that he thought he had run the greatest risk of losing the friendship of *his most powerful and friendly parliamentary advocates*, by the earnestness with which he urged it.

This last circumstance is the more worth notice, because it is impossible, if it was urged so strongly and so repeatedly, that it could have been either *misunderstood*, or *forgotten*, and that the whole was to depend upon the contingency of there *existing* what he calls a *friendly ministry*, (without which, the whole arrange-

ment was to fall to nothing,) was so very remarkable a circumstance, and one so peculiarly flattering to his parliamentary friends, that it is also impossible, if such a circumstance had been specified, that they could have either misunderstood it or forgotten it.

Having thus seen, from Dr. Milner's statement, in these letters, what was the proposition which had his sanction, let us now see what was the proposition which was made to parliament. And if it shall appear that instead of its having been conditional, and dependant *upon the existence of a friendly administration*, on such condition was mentioned: and, that, instead of the limitation upon the negative power to a certain number of times, there was no such limitation mentioned or hinted at, it will follow that there has been something most extraordinary if not most disingenuous, in the conduct of some of the parties to this transaction. That Dr. Milner should so far forget himself, as to state that he accompanied the proposition which he made to his parliamentary advocates, with those important conditions and limitations, when in point of fact he never mentioned them, is what every candid mind will feel the greatest reluctance to believe. But, that those public men, the parliamentary advocates of Dr. Milner, should have made their statement of the

proposition, as coming from Dr. Milner, and either intentionally or through inadvertence, have omitted to mention those limitations and conditions which constitute such essential parts of it—it is equally repugnant to every honourable feeling to suppose possible. It will, therefore, remain for Dr. Milner to shew how far his parliamentary friends are vindicated from the foul charge which he says has been brought against them by their political adversaries; or else to vindicate himself from having given an erroneous account of the conversation which passed between them and him.

I shall here again refer to Mr. Cobbett's *Parliamentary Register*, as the source from whence we may derive the best account of what really passed; and, at all events, one which cannot be suspected of having, intentionally, misrepresented the effect of it. In that *Register* (vol. xi. page 556), Mr. Grattan is made to say:—

“ I have a proposition to make, a proposition which the Catholics have authorised me indeed to name. It is this:—That in the future nomination of bishops HIS MAJESTY MAY INTERFERE and exercise his royal prerogative, by putting a negative upon such nomination; that is, in other words, to say—That no Catholic bishop shall be appointed without the entire approbation of his Majesty.”

Again, in a following page—

“The proposition will make a double connection. The two Churches will be as one, and the King at the head.”

Mr. Ponsonby, (*ibid*, p. 607)—after advert-
ing to the connection between the Roman Ca-
tholic clergy and the Pope, as the most weighty
circumstance—is made to say,

“The Catholics considered amongst them-
selves, and they determined to give the go-
vernment every information upon the subject,
and to make their *superior clergy subject to the
crown.*”

Then he proceeds to state the manner in
which the three candidates are now elected and
sent to the Pope; and he goes on,

“Now they have agreed,” (not, *it is con-
jectured by Dr. Milner, that they will agree,
but, after considering among themselves, they
have determined and agreed,*) “when the names
are returned, to send them to the Lord Lieute-
nant of Ireland, and if he should object to all
these, to strike them out, and send *other three*
in their stead, UNTIL THE KING’S APPROBA-
TION OF SOME ONE OF THEM BE RECEIVED.
—Even then, they send that name to Rome to
receive the approbation of the Pope. THIS,
HOWEVER, IS GIVING THE REAL AND EF-
FECTUAL NOMINATION TO THE CROWN.”

And afterwards, in his explanation upon a question put to him by Mr. Yorke, he says,

“ He made the statement upon *the authority of Dr. Milner*, who was a Catholic bishop, in this country, and *who was authorised by the Catholic bishops of Ireland* to make the proposition *in case the measure of Catholic Emancipation should be acceded to.*” (No mention of the other condition—*the existence of a friendly Administration.*) “ The proposition was this, that the person to be nominated to any vacant bishopric should be submitted to the King’s approbation, and that if the approbation was refused, another person should be proposed, AND SO ON IN SUCCESSION, UNTIL HIS MAJESTY’S APPROBATION SHOULD BE OBTAINED, SO THAT THE APPOINTMENT SHOULD FINALLY REST WITH THE KING.”

Now, let me ask, whether it be possible to reconcile this account of the speeches in parliament with Dr. Milner’s account of what he authorised his parliamentary advocates to state? Dr. Milner says the arrangement was to take place under *certain circumstances*, explained by his letters to the Roman Catholic priest to mean; *the existence of a friendly Administration.* This essential circumstance, this *sine qua non*, this condition precedent to the whole, is not once mentioned or glanced at, by either of the speakers who

made the proposition. The negative power, says Dr. Milner, "was to be limited to a certain number of times;"—and in his Letter from Cork—"must necessarily end at the rejection of the three first candidates." Mr. Ponsonby says it is to be exercised "until the King's approbation of some one of them be received." And in the other passage, "and so on in succession, till his Majesty's approbation be obtained." Dr. Milner says, the negative power was to be "so limited that it should not grow into a positive power;" not be an "actual" or "effective" power "direct or indirect!" Mr. Ponsonby, however, considers the measure proposed as giving an actual effective power to the crown; "This," however, he says, "is giving the real and effectual nomination to the crown;" and again, "so that the appointment should finally rest with the King."

But the matter by no means rests here. Dr. Milner, as has been shewn before, from his own letter, was present in the debate in the House of Commons. The debate in the House of Lords did not take place till the next day but one; there was therefore a whole intervening day, in which Dr. Milner might communicate with his noble friends. And there could not possibly have been a better opportunity for correcting any mistake which had occurred in the

House of Commons, than to have prevailed upon his friends in the House of Lords to have set this matter right, and explained the mistake into which the members of the House of Commons had fallen. Yet nothing like it appears. Lord Grenville and the Duke of Norfolk, instead of correcting the error, if it was one, repeat it; and therefore confirm the impression (the erroneous impression, Dr. Milner would call it,) which had been produced in the House of Commons.

Lord Grenville is made to say by the same Reporter:—

“It is UNQUESTIONABLY PROPER that the crown should exercise an EFFECTUAL NEGATIVE over the appointment of the persons called to execute those functions;” (meaning the bishops.) “*To this effectual power the Catholics declare themselves perfectly willing to accede.*” And in his reply; “With regard to the proposition itself, he should rather think, that instead of presenting the names of three persons to the King, for his Majesty to choose one of them, as had been mentioned, it would be more eligible to present but one name; and, if that were rejected, another, *and so on in succession, until his Majesty’s approbation should be obtained.*”

And the Duke of Norfolk, in explaining the proposition, says, (page 686,)

“ They, the Catholics, were disposed to lay before his Majesty, a list of three persons, of whom his Majesty was to be at liberty to reject two; the remaining one would be invested with the episcopal dignity; but if *his Majesty were to reject the whole three, then another list of three distinct persons would be submitted to his consideration, and so ON UNTIL HIS Majesty should signify his approbation of any individual by allowing his name to remain.*”

Here then, without wasting more time, it appears that the same proposition of *effectual interference*, without any limitation, was repeated in the House of Lords. And what is still more remarkable, Lord Grenville, in his reply, after having heard the Duke of Norfolk's distinct statement of the proposition, such as his Grace conceived it to have been made, recommends it with some variation; but that variation is proposed, as an idea of his own, as what he would “rather think to be more eligible,” and relates only to the manner in which the names should be proposed to his Majesty, without in any degree limiting the extent to which his Majesty might be at liberty to reject them.

It is certainly true, that great part of the weight of these observations, rests upon the accuracy of the report which Mr. Cobbett has given of these debates. It is therefore proper

to see how far it is reasonable that this report should be relied upon. It will be necessary, however, to defer this consideration for another letter.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

A. B.

LETTER VI.

SIR,

It is admitted, in the conclusion of my last Letter, that most of the observations there made rest upon the accuracy of the report which Mr. Cobbett has given of the debates upon the Catholic Question. It probably will be remarked, that that report is not authentic, and may be inaccurate; that Mr. Cobbett's Register is no record, possibly little more than a collection made from the different newspaper reports of the same debates; and that the inaccuracy of the newspaper reports is the continual subject of complaint. It is undoubtedly, but just that every attention should be paid to this remark, because Dr. Milner, in his Letter from Cork, alludes to the inaccuracy of these newspaper reports, denies their correctness, and

complains of the manner in which they seem to have been relied upon.

"It is evident," he says, "that the writers give implicit faith to the accounts of negligent, drowsy, tippling, and ignorant reporters, concerning the late debates, which they have seen in the newspapers. It is likewise plain that they make no allowance for the unguarded and unwarranted expressions and arguments of the orators themselves. Now, it is a fact which I can aver, as attending the whole of the debates in both houses, that the speeches themselves are most incorrectly and unfaithfully published, in most of the newspapers; that the orators themselves did not, by any means, proceed so far in their unwarranted concessions as they are reported to have gone; and that they made subsequent explanations of what they had actually said, of great importance, which are not at all noticed in the newspapers. I may add, in justice to them as well as to myself, that after the debate was over, they acknowledged themselves to have advanced certain positions, the most alarming of all that were made, for which they had no warrant but their own way of viewing the subject."

Now it certainly is nothing more than fair to give Dr. Milner the full effect of this com-

plaint, as far as it is possible; and if he has not the advantage of it to the full extent which the truth would admit of, he has nobody to blame but himself. For, as he was present at the whole of these debates, he might have told the public how far the newspapers misrepresented the *unwarranted concessions* which were made; what the explanations were which corrected the first mis-statements; nay, what were *those most alarming positions*, which, after the debate, the orators themselves acknowledged to Dr. Milner, that they had made without authority. If Dr. Milner had done this, and if, after such a statement, he had been attacked, by reference to a report of a debate, the inaccuracy of which he had corrected, he would have had good reason to complain of the unfairness of such a proceeding. But as it is, he can have no just ground of complaint. His own statement, above alluded to, admits, that *concessions were made by the orators themselves, which were unwarranted*; his own statement admits that *alarming positions were advanced*, which these orators afterwards acknowledged to him, that they had advanced, without his authority, and which were only founded upon their own view of the subject. Why, then, did not Dr. Milner state what those *unwarranted concessions* were? Why did he not state what

those *alarming positions* were which had been thus *confessedly advanced without his authority*? Why? the reason is obvious.—The object of Dr. Milner was, (in his own words,) “to vindicate these most distinguished and honorable characters, from the foul fraud, imputed to them by their political adversaries, of having proposed a plan, for a certain restricted interference of the crown, in the nomination of the Catholic prelates of Ireland, without any warrant for this purpose.”—And, if he had stated, distinctly, what they had proposed, and then confronted it with what he says he warranted them to propose; if he had specified what those concessions were, which (however overstated in the newspapers) he asserts to have been *unwarranted*, even as they were stated by the orators themselves; if he had shewn what those most alarming propositions were, which after having given them, as from authority in *public* to parliament, they were contented to acknowledge in *private* to him to have been unauthorised, it is obvious, that, instead of vindicating them from this charge of foul fraud, he would, as far as his evidence would have gone, have proved, and have established it in full force against them. Whatever allowances, therefore, may be made for the inaccuracy of the parliamentary reports, enough must remain,

according to Dr. Milner's own assertion, to shew, that, if he is to be relied upon, his parliamentary advocates advanced a proposition to parliament, as coming from the Roman Catholic bishops, under the authority of Dr. Milner, when Dr. Milner says he never gave them such authority to advance *any* proposition; but only ventured to *conjecture* and *presume* what would be the disposition of these bishops upon this point; and that the proposition itself, which they advanced, contained in it concessions, which he never warranted in any manner, and alarming positions, which those advocates themselves acknowledged to him they had advanced merely upon their own views, and which he would have lost his life rather than have suffered to be adopted.

Whether, therefore, Dr. Milner is to be believed, or whether his parliamentary friends are to be trusted, is the matter in dispute between them. That Dr. Milner has not vindicated but condemned them, if he is to be relied upon, is quite clear. But it does seem a little unfortunate for the clearing up of this strange business, that Dr. Milner, instead of stating, as it appears he has done, from recollection, what passed at these conversations, did not introduce into his letter, a copy of *that short printed paper which* * he says, *was composed by him, dated May 26,*

* See his Letter to the Morning Chronicle.

1808, *and is now in the hands of different gentlemen.*

He says, "that paper will shew that he has not *materially* varied in his present exposure, from that which he made at the time of the debates." The reference to that paper without its production is undoubtedly a curious circumstance. The public would probably have been better pleased to have seen the variations which he does not deem *material*, and to have judged of their *materiality* for themselves. That paper, if it had been produced, dated, as he says, on the day between the two debates, would have shewn upon the face of it, the impression which he had of the conversation at that early period; and would probably have shewn that impression also, with direct reference to those misrepresentations, which had been made of his conversation, by his friends in the House of Commons.

The existence of that paper is naturally connected with some questions, which must be answered before this strange transaction can be satisfactorily explained. Did Dr. Milner, or did he not, communicate that paper, or the contents of it, to his *noble* friends before the debate in the House of Lords? If he did not, what reason can be given, why, having so convenient and accurate a mode of communicating, precisely, what he meant to his noble advocates,

he did not, by sending them that paper, avail himself of their assistance to correct the error, into which his friends had fallen in the House of Commons? or why he did not furnish them with those materials which would have precluded the possible repetition of the same mistake by themselves in the House of Lords? and if he did communicate it to their lordships, it would remain for their lordships to vindicate themselves, for their imperfect and unfaithful execution of an authority, which had been, with such accurate precision, intrusted to them.

The remainder of the letter in the Morning Chronicle, in which Dr. Milner proceeds to state, not what he proposed to his parliamentary friends, but what he should not now object to, may well be passed over without any notice. The only object of these letters being to prove, by pointing out the insufficiency of the explanation which has been given, the injustice which has been done to the public (Roman Catholic as well as Protestant) by one or other of the parties to the declarations in question. Dr. Milner's *present* statement of a proposition upon this point, with the qualifications which he *now* thinks would render it unobjectionable, is *nothing* to this purpose; especially as he admits that he did not give his ideas, upon this subject, to his parliamentary friends, "quite so clearly and in detail as he

does in his letter;" and as he says also, that
 * "It is very possible some of the personages
 whom I had the honour of then communicating
 with, may not have fully comprehended my
 meaning; and I have reason to suppose that the
 concessions as they are here stated in this ex-
 posure, fall short of the idea which the public
 formed of them as they were first laid down."

Why he did not state them thus "clearly,"
 and in this "detail," to his parliamentary friends,
 seeing the importance which he conceives to be-
 long to them, it is difficult to understand. And
 as the concessions, which he states, in that ex-
 posure, do, in his opinion, fall short of the idea
 which the public formed of them, why he let
 that public remain so long in ignorance of the
 real extent of them, is equally inconceivable.

Under a strong impression and conviction
 that the public have been grossly and unjustifi-
 ably imposed upon, by some of the parties to
 this transaction, I have been desirous first of
 proving the fact, that such imposition was prac-
 tised; and next, of discovering upon whom the
 blame of having practised that imposition should
 rest. That this is no unimportant enquiry must
 be admitted. For, if it could be plainly disco-
 vered which of the parties had practised the im-
 position, it would at the same time be ascer-

* See Appendix Letter to Morning Chronicle.

tained, which of the parties could not again be trusted.

Whoever has taken the trouble to peruse these letters, must perceive that I have succeeded in establishing the fact, that *the public have been imposed upon*; but that I have failed in fixing the guilt of the imposition upon either party.

That a proposition was made to parliament by some of the most distinguished parliamentary characters in both houses, who distinctly stated themselves to be authorised by Dr. Milner, as the accredited agent of the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, to make it in their name, is quite clear.—That this proposition contained the expression of a disposition in those prelates to make certain concessions in regard to the future elections of their bishops, is quite clear.—That Dr. Milner has declared, that he never gave these parliamentary characters any authority to use the name of the Roman Catholic bishops;—that Dr. Milner has denied that he ever authorised, either in his own name, or in that of the Roman Catholic bishops, the proposal which was made;—that he has declared, that he knows that such a proposal would be schismatical and unlawful, and that he would die rather than consent to it;—that the Roman Catholic bishops themselves have declared, in full synod, that they think it inexpedient to admit of *any* alteration in the

mode of electing their bishops, and, consequently, that they have not at this time, whatever may have been their previous feeling upon this subject, the disposition to make the concessions which were offered in their name;—all these propositions are quite clear. And it follows, as a necessary consequence, that whatever part of the parliament and the public were led to believe the declarations, which were made in parliament in the name of these prelates, have been grossly misled and imposed upon. But who is in fault amongst these parties, remains in doubt. Whether the friends of the Roman Catholics, in parliament, assumed an authority which had never been reposed in them? Whether they garbled the proposition, which they were authorised to make, leaving out those qualifications and limitations which it might be thought, would prevent its having the effect which they wished it to produce? or whether Dr. Milner assumed an authority, which the bishops never gave him; and offered a proposition, which, he now feels it necessary (from observing the aversion which is felt to, it among the Irish Roman Catholics) to soften, to qualify, and to recall? are questions of which, the information before the public does not afford any satisfactory solution. If, indeed, it was just to impute to Dr. Milner, and the generality of the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, the

principles of that Jesuitical casuistry which the titular Roman Catholic bishop of Ossory has lately avowed, there would be less difficulty in the question; and the parliamentary advocates of the Roman Catholics would at least find no difficulty in getting rid of the effect of Dr. Milner's evidence against them, and, without further proof, would be easily acquitted of every thing but folly in relying upon Dr Milner.

Those principles, and that avowal, are so important, at this time, with reference to the very question now before us, that it will hardly be any digression, certainly no unuseful one, to state them and to comment on them.

It appears then that the titular Bishop of Ossory had promised to sign certain addresses of thanks to the persons, who had taken the part of the Roman Catholics in the late debates in parliament; and having afterwards, in breach of that promise, refused to sign them, he was charged, in consequence, with a breach of a *solemn* promise, and he has published what he calls a plain narrative of facts, which, he says, will complete his justification in the eyes of any impartial man.

* In the first place, the *plain* narrative begins with a distinction between a *serious* promise and a *solemn* promise, and he admits he made a *serious* promise, but denies having made a *solemn* one.

* See Appendix, No. VI.

What the use of asserting this distinction was, unless it were to prepare the public for the casuistry which was to follow, does not clearly appear. For having admitted that he made a *serious* promise, he proceeds to admit, that he is convinced that a *serious, sincere, and voluntary* promise, binds a man who makes it, under the pain of sin, to fulfil it. And he does not defend himself for the non-performance of his promise, by alleging that it was not *seriously* or *voluntarily* made, nor even that he was not *sincere* when he made it; nor does he, indeed, assert, that a want of sincerity on his part, at the time when he made his promise, would have justified his breaking it; although, by describing the sort of promise which he admits to be binding, by the qualification of its being *sincere*, as well as of its being *serious* and *voluntary*, he does give no small reason to conclude, that he thinks insincerity would be an excuse for breaking it.

Having, however, stated the sort of promise which he held to be valid, he then proceeds to state the cases in which the binding obligation of a promise ceases, and the one upon which he relies he thus explains :

“ 5thly, When, before the promise is fulfilled, the circumstances become so changed, that the person promising, had he foreseen these circum-

stances, would never have made the promise. "On this case," he says, "I rest my justification; for had I foreseen, or known, *that my signing these addresses would produce such alarm or consternation, such dislike or disapprobation, as I afterwards found*, they would, in the minds of the great majority of the Catholic priests and laity, in this country, *I would by no means have consented to sign them.*

"St. Thomas says, that a man is not guilty of an untruth in such a case, because when he promised he intended to perform his promise; nor is he unfaithful to his promise, because the circumstances are changed afterwards. This is not only the opinion of St. Thomas, but is also the opinion of *all the theologians and canonists I ever saw or read.* JAMES LANIGAN."

Who this St. Thomas is whom the reverend bishop quotes as his authority, for this excellent piece of casuistry, I do not know; but I cannot help expressing a hope, that neither that saint, nor the other theologians and canonists, from whom alone the reverend bishop has learnt all his casuistry, are the authors whose morals are taught to the students at Maynooth.

If we were at liberty to ascribe similar principles to Dr. Milner, and the Roman Catholic prelates in general, undoubtedly they might say for themselves, with as good a grace as Dr.

Lanigan, that if they had known, that the proposition which was to be offered in their name, through Dr. Milner, would have created such an alarm among their flock, they would not have offered it. And it must be remembered, that Dr. Milner, in his letter in the *Morning Chronicle*, has provided them with this excuse, for he gives one reason for the resolution of the bishops in their synod in these words:—

• “ Lastly, we find that a vast majority of our people is decidedly against the concessions, in-somuch that we should lose their confidence and our influence over them, were we at present to sanction it.”

With Dr. Lanigan's principles, therefore, so far from being bound by the *offer*, they would not even have been bound had they *promised* to abide by it; neither would they have been bound, if, upon the faith of it, parliament had actually granted what they requested.

For I would wish to ask Dr. Lanigan himself, whether, if the petitions of the Roman Catholics, as presented in the last session of parliament, were to be granted, even on the express promise, that the petitioners should rest satisfied, and should not endeavour, by fresh petitions, to procure additional indulgences; to procure, for instance, for their priests and prelates a share in the tithes, the emoluments and

legal dignities of the establishment, such promise would, upon his principles, be binding, or give any ground of security to the Established Church? or whether, on the contrary, when upon the granting of such petitions, seats in parliament, and offices of weight and influence in the state, were opened to them, high place would not recal high thoughts? Whether, in the increase of their power, in the improved hope of being able to procure better terms for their Church, and above all, in the nearer prospect of its re-establishment, *such an unforeseen change of circumstances would not exist* as would be sufficient, upon the Rev. Prelate's principles, to release them from the obligation of their former promise? and whether, this same St. Thomas would not furnish him with an authority for discovering, in the circumstances of *prior* and *superior* obligation to the Roman Catholic Church, an additional motive for not keeping a promise which St. Thomas would probably contend must have been unlawful from the beginning, from its injurious effect upon those sacred interests, which it was the primary duty of all good Roman Catholics to promote? Whether such promise made under the pain and duress (as the lawyers would call it) of their present state of alleged persecution, might not for that reason also be held to be void? Whe-

ther ingenuity, in short, could ever fail to discover as good a reason for the breach of a promise, as that upon which Dr. Lanigan relies for his excuse and justification? or, whether, in other words, such principles as these would not reduce the obligation of a promise to the mere convenience of performing it? And, lastly, whether Dr. Lanigan can possibly fail to acknowledge traits of ingenious morality congenial to his own, in the language which Milton puts into the great author of all such casuistry:—

How soon

“ Would height recal high thoughts? how soon unsay

“ What *feign'd* submission swore? Ease would recant

“ Vows made in pain, as impotent and void.”?

But it is needless to press this further; it would be unjust to fix Dr. Milner, or the other bishops, with Dr. Lanigan's principles, till they avow them; and, therefore no assistance can be derived from Dr. Lanigan's Letter, towards discovering the guilty author of the imposition, which has by some one been practised upon the public.

Here then I shall close these Letters. It is no part of their object to examine the admissibility of the proposition itself, either as it appears to have been proposed to parliament, or as Dr. Milner now says he would be willing it

should be adopted. The object of these Letters would have been best answered, if they had enabled the public to ascertain the party upon whom the guilt of this imposition should attach. But they will have attained no immaterial point, if they shall have succeeded in shewing the insufficiency of any explanation which has, as yet, been given of this extraordinary transaction; and, consequently, in putting the public and parliament upon their guard, against being again so easily misled to believe what the sanguine advocates of the Roman Catholics may venture to assert, with respect to the disposition of the Roman Catholic bishops, or Roman Catholics in general, upon any part of this important subject.

I am, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

A. B.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX, No. I.

A LETTER FROM THE REV. DR. MILNER, BISHOP OF CASTABALA, VIC. APOST., TO A PARISH PRIEST OF IRELAND.

(*Extracted from the Dublin Evening Herald of September 21 and 28, and October 10, in which it was published by a Person signing himself SARSTIELD.*)

Rev. Sir ;

How strange does it appear to me that I, who, but the other day, was *overwhelmed* with the thanks and praises of my brethren, and particularly of my clerical brethren in Ireland, should now have become the subject of their *obloquy* and odium ! How still more strange does it seem that this change should have taken place on the supposition of my betraying the cause of the Catholic Church and its prelacy ; that cause which I have been labouring with all my might to support during these twenty years, and never more zealously or more vigorously than within the last three months ! But, *say*, it is hardly less strange that all this should have happened on the mere credit of newspapers, and that none of my former friends should have expressed a wish, so much as to receive accurate information from me, on the subject of these accusations ; *say*, that some of them should have forbidden me to furnish them with any ! Such are

the effects, upon 'common candour and common sense,' among Catholics, no less than among Protestants, of that maddening cry, 'the Church is in danger.' My only comfort under this extraordinary persecution is, that it proceeds from a principle of orthodoxy, which I cannot but approve of and love. The *hearts* of my former friends are quite *right*, though their *heads* are not a little *wrong*.

In the first place, sir, it is notorious that, ever since the year 1789, I have been in a state of hostility, by the pen and by every other means in my power, with the spiritual supremacy of the crown, and the prevailing encroachments of the civil upon the ecclesiastical power; look in particular at the Preface to the Meditations of St. Teresa; the Letters upon the Appointments of Bishops; the Divine Right of the Episcopacy; Ecclesiastical Democracy Detected; the Appendix No. 5 to Sir John O'Hippsely's Substance of Additional Observations, and the Supplement to ditto, in Four Letters lately printed; look also at various passages in the Antiquities of Winchester; the Letters to a Prebendary, and the Letters from Ireland; and then say, however weak an advocate I have been for the Church, liberty, and independence, whether I have not been at least, a zealous and indefatigable one. In the course of this long continued controversy, there have not been wanting, as it is natural to suppose, and as I can prove to have been the case, both promises to leave me, and menaces to frighten us from the straight line of my duty to the Catholic Church. I have, nevertheless, during all that period, preserved my reputation untainted. How unlikely, then, is it that I should at the present moment, yield to be "tam-

pered with," as the newspapers assert, by persons, *who have nothing to give me!* and that I should aim a *mortal blow* at that mystical spouse of Christ, (as I have been accused in private letters,) to whose preservation and service I have devoted the whole of my life; and for the least of whose rights I am always ready, with God's grace, to shed the last drop of my blood.

In the next place, sir, you will observe that it is not I who have wantonly or imprudently brought forward this delicate question, concerning the interference of the crown, in the appointment of Catholic bishops; it has been for some years past before the public; and many writers, as well *Catholics* as *Protestants* have, to my grief and astonishment, declared themselves for it in its most objectionable form, and without any qualification whatsoever. See in particular Sir John Throckmorton's *Considerations arising out of the Debates, &c. on the Catholic Petition, in 1805*; *Thoughts on the Civil Condition of the Catholic Clergy, by T. M'Kenna, Esq.*; as also the celebrated *Letters of Peter Flynnley*, so called, in which the writer asserts, that he is "authorised" to assert that the Catholics have no objection whatever to the measure. You will recollect that something to the same effect is contained in the late *Petition to Parliament of the inhabitants of Newry*, and it is notorious that a great number of the most respectable Catholics, as well as the generality of our Protestant friends, ceased not to proclaim that "the present mode of appointing our prelates, was the chief, and almost only obstacle to the so much wished for union, and that the situation of public affairs, and the safety of the common empire, absolutely require that this power should be lodged in the

crown. The population of Ireland, they ceased not to exclaim, "is at the beck of the Catholic bishops; these bishops are chosen by others, who are the creatures of the Pope, and are instituted by the Pope, who himself is the *slave and tool* of the public enemy." I mention these circumstances, not by way of intimating any acquiescence in a measure, which, taken as it was proposed, I know to be unlawful and schismatical. So far, indeed, from acquiescing in it, I wrote most pressinglly during the last spring to two of your venerable metropolitans, in order to consult with them on the best mode of defeating it; and it is a fact which I declare upon my conscience, that my chief motive for going up to London about ten weeks ago, was to oppose the measure, had it been brought forward in parliament, as I feared would be the case; being deeply conscious that it was my duty to do so, even at the expence of my life. Amongst other arguments with which I had provided myself for this purpose, was the well-known declaration of Mr. Burke, signifying that "the members of one Church are never fit persons to appoint the ministers of another." This declaration I carried about with me for a long time in my pocket-book. — But to return from this digression: my motive for stating the above-mentioned circumstances is to show that it was not I who created the present embarrassment, but that it existed long ago; and to convince you that it is *likely* to continue from the joint attack upon you of both Catholics and Protestants, should your prelates at the present critical juncture, recede from their solemn resolution of 1763, — which resolution declares: "That in the appointment of prelates of the Roman Catholic religion, no vacant seat within the king-

day, such interference of government, as may enable it to be *satisfied* of the *loyalty* of the person to be appointed, is *just*, and ought to be agreed to."

It was from a recollection of the tenor of these resolutions, and of the conversations which I had held last summer with different prelates, that I gave the answers that I did give to several of our illustrious and generous parliamentary advocates, when they demanded of me, in London, a very few days before the first debate took place, how far the *Catholic prelates* were disposed to give *satisfaction* to the legislature and the nation in the *important* article of nomination to their vacant prelacies? My answer, on the different occasions alluded to, was uniformly to the following effect:—That I had no instructions from the Irish prelates on the subject proposed, and that the shortness of the time, previous to the day appointed for the debate, did not permit me to receive any instruction; and that therefore I could give no absolute pledge on their behalf: I said, however, that I had *good* reason to believe that they never would consent to attribute any *positive* power to the crown, not even so far as to its *selecting one* candidate out of *three* of the prelates *own* proposing: nevertheless, that in case there were to be a *friendly Ministry* and that the emancipation were to take place, I thought they would not be averse to consult his Majesty's Ministers, after they themselves had chosen, in the usual way, the person fittest to be presented to the Pontiff, in order to ascertain whether these Ministers entertained any *suspicion* of the purity of this person's civil and *political* conduct and principles; which in fact is to ascribe to the crown a negative power and interference in this trans-

action. I added, however, that they would not, according to my notions, allow the crown an unrestrained negative power, as this might be made to operate like a positive power, and open a door to *intrigue* and *ambition*; but that they would wish to restrain the negative power or veto to a *reasonable* number of times. I must observe, that by the term a reasonable number of times, I did not understand, as it has been objected to me, an indefinite number of times, to be left open for contention between Ministry and the prelates, as the case should occur, but a *definite* number, whether twice, thrice, or four times, to be settled by the latter whenever the proposed *treaty* should be actually concluded.

Such, sir, were the *guarded* terms in which I proposed to our legislators my opinion of what the Irish prelates would agree to; for I always professed to have no authority or instructions from them on the subject. *If*, then, in the warmth of debate, any of the illustrious personages who advocated our cause, should have forgotten my statement, or should have *indulged their imagination* in the flowery fields of rhetoric, I hope I am not more accountable for this than I am for the stupid, blundering report of many other parts of the debates which have appeared in the newspapers. It would be *indelicate* and ungenerous to enter into *certain* particulars which I have alluded to on the present occasion; but thus much I may be allowed to state, that one Right Honourable Gentleman, who is represented in the newspapers as professing to make a certain proposal from authority, barely said, that he made it *almost* from authority; and that another Right Honourable Gentleman, the *bold* flights of whose eloquence, with the help of newspaper *fabrication*,

have chiefly contributed to raise the present *outray* in Ireland, did, in his explanation, confine himself *pretty nearly* to the account which I have given above of my conversation to him.

I now proceed to shew upon what grounds I rested my opinion that the Irish prelates, in the event of a friendly Ministry succeeding to power, and of the emancipation being granted, would not hesitate (under the *presumed* sanction of his Holiness) to admit of a limited power of exclusion in the executive government. The first of these grounds is the actual consent which they (that is to say, the four metropolitans, and six of the most *ancient* bishops, speaking in the name of the *whole* episcopal body !) have *actually* given to the proposed measure, in their solemn deliberations held at Dublin on the 17th, 18th, and 19th of January, 1799. In these deliberations, having premised “the *justice* and *propriety* of the interference of government in the appointment of Catholic bishops, as far as is necessary to ascertain their loyalty,” they resolve as follows:—

Art. 4. “The candidate so elected (that is, according to the usual forms) to be presented by the President of the election to government, which, within one month after such presentation, will transmit the name of said candidate (if no objection be against him) for appointment to the holy see: or return said name to the President of the election, for such transmission as shall be agreed upon.”

Art. 5. “If government have any *proper* objection against such candidate, the President of the election will be informed thereof within one month after presentation, who in that case will convene the electors, and proceed to

the election of another candidate." Signed, "R. O'Reilly, I. T. Troy, Edward Dillon, Thomas Bray, P. J. Plunkett, F. Moylan, Dan. Delany, Edm. French, James Caulfield, John Cruise." With respect to these resolutions I have to observe, First, that they are in the hands, as I have reason to believe, both of *Ministry* and of the *Opposition*, and are considered by *both* as *binding* upon the *episcopal* body. Secondly, that the exclusive power itself, or the right of the *veto* is not less explicitly offered in them than it is mentioned in my negotiations. Thirdly, that the necessary checks upon this *veto* are not so *distinctly* expressed in the former, as they are in the latter. This I think I can shew in several instances.

My second ground for the opinion which I have stated, is the *implied* consent of the "sacred congregation of the propaganda" to the proposed *veto*, with respect to the Catholic prelates of England, on the supposition of this measure appearing requisite, and in case *proper* restrictions should be devised for preventing the *exclusive* power of the crown from becoming an *absolute* power; which restrictions, I think, are provided in the above-stated proposals. I shall take care that the *original* note of the "sacred congregation" here alluded to, and which was addressed to me, in *answer to my enquiries*, be laid before your assembled prelates.

In the third place I have to observe, that the exercise of ecclesiastical power being of *so much consequence* to the welfare of the state, there is, perhaps, no *civilized christian country* in which the government does not interfere in the appointment of the prelates, who are to exercise this power; and it is judged that there is *no country in which this interference is so necessary as in Ireland!!!*

In Catholic countries, the prince nominates without any controul, and the Pope gives jurisdiction as a matter of course. In almost every *uncatholic* country means are provided, and care is taken, both by those who have a right to present, and by the Holy See herself, that no person obnoxious to the sovereign, shall be raised to the prelacy within her dominions. The sovereigns of *Russia* and of *Prussia* will be found to have exercised a power in this respect, which *far exceeds* that which the Irish prelates have offered to his Majesty, and accordingly these sovereigns had each of them an *accredited agent* at Rome, chiefly for the exercise of this power. The King himself enjoys it, with the consent of Rome, in the province of *Canada*: the Bishop of *Quebec* not being allowed so much as to choose his coadjutor, until the latter has been approved by the civil Governor.

Fourthly, whatever outcries of the “Church in danger” may have been raised by *ignorant, or violent Catholics in Ireland*, I challenge any learned divine, or other writer to shew, that the allowance to government of an exclusive power, in presenting to Catholic prelacies, if confined to three times, and accompanied, each time, with the avowal of a well-grounded *suspicion* of the candidate’s loyalty, contains any thing either *unlawful* in itself, or *dangerous* to the church. For it is to be observed, that it is the Pope, (whose rights are not touched in the present proposal, and who can refuse jurisdiction and the permission for consecration, when every other party is agreed,) it is the Pope, I say, who *makes* the Catholic bishop. The other prelates do no more than *present* a fit subject to his Holiness; and what they are supposed to agree to, or rather what

they have agreed to in their resolutions, *may be explained* by them in the following terms : “ It is an invariable rule with us, never to present any priest for episcopal jurisdiction, whose *civil* or *political* principles we *judge* to be *suspected* by government. For it is of so much consequence, that the bishop of a district should stand well with the civil power, that we would, on every occasion, set aside *any three of the most deserving priests*, candidates for the episcopacy, who laboured under that *disadvantage*, and we would choose some other good and learned man, but of *inferior* qualifications, if we could only, *by this means*, preserve a good understanding with government. Instead however, of *guessing* (as we have hitherto done) at this circumstance, namely, whether his Majesty’s Ministers have *heard* any thing disadvantageous of the *political* character of the priest we approve of, we will, henceforward, *since we are permitted and desired to do so!* immediately ask them the question. If they answer in the affirmative, it is *a hundred to one* that we shall be able to vindicate *the priest’s character*; and thus, instead of being *more* shackled, we shall be *less* shackled than we have heretofore been in the choice of candidates; and instead of that *real, and extensive, though silent power* which government has hitherto exercised over us in the choice of our prelates, this power will in future be confined within very narrow, because *aroused, just, and rational bounds !!!*”

Fifthly, the great and signal *advantages* which the Catholic religion, and *its prelates in particular*, would derive from the realizing the proposal which they made in 1799, are so obvious, that *they hardly stand in need of being pointed out!* In the first place, one of the chief ob-

stacles to the emancipation would be removed, and thereby the affection of the *Catholic laity* for the bishops and clergy would be *increased*.—Next, the *character* of a Catholic bishop, which, we are assured is not now recognized by the law, would be incontrovertibly established.—The bishop elect, *having gone through his political purgation!* would be far less exposed to suspicion and obloquy than is the case with *Catholic prelates* at present.—Finally, a thorough good understanding and mutual confidence would be established between the *civil* and *ecclesiastical* power; in consequence of which the *Irish Catholic prelate* would acquire his *proper* weight and influence in the scale of the empire. This weight and influence he would not fail to employ a thousand ways for the benefit of the Catholic religion, and particularly of his poor people, in protecting them from the oppression of their most powerful enemies.

I have heard but of two objections to the proposals in question: the first of which is the outcry of the *lower* order of the Catholics; and I am sorry to say (*for I had formed a higher idea of their abilities and learning*) of some of the clergy, as if the *rights* of their Church were about to be *surrendered*, and as if the *King's ecclesiastical supremacy* over it were about to be *acknowledged*. But since this opinion is founded on the *grossest error*, as I have demonstrated, nothing is so easy as to dissipate it, by exposing the true state of facts, in opposition to newspaper falsehoods, and by explaining, in its several parts, the *true system* of canonical elections. The other objection has appeared in point, and stands thus: “It is a great detriment that a priest of eminent merit, an O’Leary, for example, should be liable to be excluded

from the prelacy, in consequence of government's *unfounded* prejudices against him." — I grant that this is a great *detriment to the Church* as well as an *injury to the individual*. But then I have shewn that this inconvenience exists already, in as much as *the prelates will not recommend even an O'Leary*, whilst any violent prejudice of government exists against him, whether well or *ill* founded; and I have also shewn, that there is a much better chance of *such prejudice* being done away, by means of a free communication between the electors and government, than if no such communication were to take place. I must add that the Holy See, *during the existence of such prejudice*, would refuse spiritual powers to the candidate, as she professes in the above-mentioned paper, not only to reject candidates who are *disagreeable* to government, but also to promote those *exclusively* who are agreeable to it.

But you propose, it seems, to *satisfy* the legislature and the nation (that the *public enemy* shall not be able to *influence* the election of your prelates in favour of *disaffected* subjects), by means of an oath of allegiance to be taken by the electors and the person elected,—I wish, sir, you may succeed; but I am not aware that you or any other person can devise a form of oath more *solemn, express, or comprehensive, as to the duty of allegiance*, than that which we have already taken. Should any new oath be required of us, I greatly fear it shall go to that mischief with which we have already been *threatened* by *Catholics* no less than *Protestants*, (see *Considerations, &c.* by Sir J. Throckmorton, &c.) and which otherwise, I apprehend, it will require great efforts to *ward off*—I mean an *obligation* on the part of the prelates, *never to*

correspond with the Holy See, *but through the Secretary of State's office!!!*

* Your zealous and enlightened prelates (*one half of whom I have the honour of knowing personally, and the other half by character*) will, at the ensuing assembly; weigh and decide upon the whole of this important matter. It has been said that I *deprecate* that assembly: I can prove directly the contrary; and I am, on all occasions, the decided and warm advocate for canonical councils and synods of every kind, as the grand specific against all spiritual and ecclesiastical disorders. There are only *three* things which I deprecate; first, the *degradation* in the eyes of the public of that *episcopal* order to which I myself have the honour of belonging, and particularly of the illustrious prelacy which I have so highly extolled. Secondly, an *opposition* of the *leading* Catholic laity against their *prelates*, under an idea that the latter refused to *adopt* such means as are in their *power* for promoting *their* emancipation. Thirdly, a disunion of heart and co-operation among the prelates themselves.—I would suffer every calamity myself, rather than *any one* of these three mischiefs were to ensue.

Should the prelates recede from the resolutions they entered into at Dublin in 1799, (which resolutions, observe, are before the public, as well as the leading men of the legislature, having been mentioned in the *newspapers*;) I *hope* they will be *able* to *indicate* their proceedings and *character*, against the numerous and *able* opponents of each communion, who will not fail to attack them on the subject, and *harass* them for many years to come.—I *hope* they will provide answers, and *such* answers as may be defended against men of talents to

the following questions, which will incessantly be put to them, as they have in part been already frequently put to me. "The head of the Church is allowed a direct interference and power in the appointment of bishops throughout the greater part of the Christian Continent, to a man who has *apostatized to Mahometanism*, and shall it be deemed unlawful for our Monarch to interfere in this business just so far as it is *necessary* to ascertain the *loyalty* of men, who are to possess such great influence over his subjects?" "The schismatical Sovereign of Russia, and the heretical King of Prussia have always been consulted in the choice of Catholic prelates for the vacancies within their respective dominions; what then *hinders the Sovereign of the United Kingdom* from enjoying the same privilege?—He actually possesses it now in his American dominions; is *that unlawful* in Ireland which is *lawful* in Canada? But you have already declared, after three days solemn deliberation on the subject, that *such interference of government in the appointment* of prelates as may enable it to be *satisfied* of the *loyalty* of the person to be appointed is *just and ought to be agreed to*; and that, therefore, the candidate elected is to be presented to government: "and that *if government has any proper objection* against him, the president will convene the electors, and proceed to the election of another candidate." "Such were your decisions delivered to government nine years ago, and which have remained with it ever since, *to be acted upon whenever circumstances should permit!!! Do you break faith* with it? Or is *that* become false and unlawful *now*, which was true and baneful *then*? In a word, will you reject these resolutions (for the purpose of

quieting the alarms of the nation, and promoting the emancipation) which you heretofore voluntarily made in order to obtain a provision for yourselves ? !!!”

Such are the objections in part, which *I am confident* will be thus held out against the prelates *on every side*, should they retract their decisions. It is wise, sir, to anticipate mischief of every kind, in order to guard against it. If, on the other hand, the prelates *should abide* by what they have *solemnly* resolved upon, they *will have nothing more to do than what is perfectly within their sphere*, and what is comparatively easy to be done; namely, to *enlighten* their people, and shew them how *grossly* they have been imposed upon, both as to *facts and reasoning*.

I answer, 1st, as far as our English Catholic prelaties are concerned, (*and that these are or will be concerned, whenever this business is to be concluded*, I have very good reason to believe,) I acted as the Vicar Apostolic of fifteen counties in the centre of England, and as Deputy for the Western prelaties; I acted as the “ Agent of the Catholic prelates and clergy of Ireland, *at the seat of government*, in such concerns as I had been, or might be instructed by them to transact on this account; having been authorised to this effect at Maynooth, July 1st, 1807, under the hands and seals of the four metropolitans, in the presence, and with the approbation, as it appeared to me, of other prelates. *But it has been said*, if I am not misinformed, that there is *no ecclesiastical canon* which constitutes the *metropolitans themselves representatives of the other prelates*, in the transacting business of this nature with the Imperial Parliament.—
2d. *Grant* there is no such canon, neither is there *any*

which appoints *bishops to represent* the officiating clergy, nor the *officiating* clergy to represent the *inferior*, and the *regular* clergy. Must it be an *unpracticable* thing to communicate with the prelates and clergy of Ireland, for the *benefit* of religion and *themselves* ! ? In fact, the metropolitans, from their *dignity*, their *authority*, their *local situation* in the four provinces of Ireland ; and, I will add, from their *merits* and *qualifications* are, *morally speaking*, the *proper representatives* of their *brethren*, and the *other clergy*, and as such have been allowed by the legislature and the public to represent them, in signing the Petition of 1805, and on several other occasions : however, to remove all jealousies that you may entertain *on my account*, I assure you, sir, that I have *ceased* to describe and consider myself as *Agent* of the Irish prelates and clergy, from the moment that I understood there was the slightest question on this subject with *any* individual. My anxiety, however, for the welfare of our common religion, on various recurring occasions, for the defence of the Irish prelates, individually, no less than generally, as I have often experienced, and for the particular support of that spiritual jurisdiction, and those rights of the Church, which are the subject of the *present misunderstanding* between so many *zealous*, but *misinformed* Catholics, and *myself* ; make me anxious that some other person or persons of the *prelatic*, or at least of the *sacerdotal* character, should be duly and unanimously appointed to *transact* the particular concerns of religion and of its ministers at the *seat of government*. Without such an agency, you leave every thing that is most dear to you in the hands of lay people, who neither *understand* nor *care*,

for *more* ecclesiastical matters. You will easily find *agents* of greater talents, experience, and suppleness, than myself; but you will not find one more rigidly, therwise, more jealous of the rights of the Church and the prelacy, more disinterested, more docile to the instructions of his constituents, or more zealously devoted to the welfare of the Irish Catholics, than is,

Sir, your humble servant,

J. MILNER.

Wolverhampton, August 1, 1808.

P. S. I must add here, that in my communication with certain members of the legislature, *equally powerful and friendly*, I contended *so strongly* and *so repeatedly* for the necessity of even the *negative* power being restricted to a certain number of times, to be afterwards determined upon by the prelates themselves, (for on this delicate point I could not so much as hazard an opinion,) that I conceived myself to run the greatest risk of *losing their friendship !!!*

APPENDIX, No. II.

LETTER FROM DR. MILNER TO THE EDITOR OF THE
MORNING CHRONICLE; PUBLISHED IN THAT PAPER
OF THE NINETEENTH OF NOVEMBER.

Mr. Editor;

IT was not till within these four days, that I met with your *Chronicles* of October 15th and 17th. Observing in these, and in some other periodical publications, the manner in which my name is introduced, for the purpose of aspersing some of the most distinguished and honourable characters in the United Parliament; as if they had proposed a plan for a certain restricted interference of the crown in the nomination of the Catholic prelates of Ireland, without any warrant for this purpose; and that my sentiments on this subject, expressed on one occasion, are quoted in opposition to those which I have expressed on another occasion, I think myself called upon to vindicate those personages, and to do justice to myself before the public; which, with your permission, I will attempt in your *Chronicle*. The public will not be averse from hearing me, upon a subject on which it has repeatedly called for information.

Some few days before the discussion took place in parliament upon the Catholic Petition, I was summoned to wait upon some of the leading members, and was interrogated by them, in quality of agent to the Catholic

prelates of Ireland, as to the mode observed in filling up *vacancies in their body*, and as to the means of obtaining an additional pledge, which in the then existing state of Europe was thought requisite, that none but men of the most approved loyalty and peaceable conduct, should be chosen for this purpose. My answer, in the different communications I had upon this subject, was to the following effect :—That I had no specific instructions on this subject from my constituents; and that there was not time, previously to the expected debate, for obtaining any instructions from Ireland :—That I knew full well the Catholic Bishop could not give to his Majesty, nor he, as head of the Established Church, receive, a right of patronage, or any other *positive power* in this concern, as this would be an incontestible pledge and act of *mutual religious communion* :—Nevertheless, that I had very good reason to believe, the Catholic bishops of Ireland would not be averse, under certain circumstances, and as part of a general arrangement, from conceding to the crown a certain *negative power*, or *veto*, such as would, in my opinion, afford the desired pledge; provided always, that this power were limited within the bounds necessary for the safety as well as for the independency of our Church, and in such manner as to prevent the *negative power* from becoming a *positive power*, and from being otherwise abused, for the oppression, corruption, or detriment of our religion.

Whoever duly weighs this statement, sees that our parliamentary advocates were warranted in the declarations which they made in parliament, to the extent and in the manner here set down; and it is my duty thus publicly to avow the share which I took in the warrant

under which they spoke of the presumed disposition of the Irish prelates to make the desired concessions. On the other hand, he will see, that I did not hold out any the most distant prospect of these prelates yielding to the crown any degree of ecclesiastical supremacy, or actual power, direct or indirect, over the Catholic Church of Ireland. In short, he will acquit the Honourable and Noble Personages alluded to, of the foul fraud imputed to them by their political adversaries; and he will acquit me also of the inconsistencies with which I have been charged in the newspapers, with respect to my declarations and writings on different occasions.

II. In a matter of so much importance to many respectable persons, as well as to myself, and which is likely to undergo much discussion at the approaching meeting of parliament, I shall be readily excused by the public, for laying before it, distinctly and fully, the plan which I endeavoured to give a general idea of to the members of parliament with whom I communicated, as being unexceptionable, in my own private opinion, and as being likely to meet with the approbation of the Catholic bishops in Ireland. We cannot then, as I have before mentioned, admit of any *direct power* in the crown, over the appointment of our bishops, or the other concerns of our religion; because this would be to acknowledge the royal ecclesiastical supremacy, which, if we could reconcile to our consciences, we might spare our parliamentary friends an infinite deal of trouble, by taking the oath provided for this purpose. In fact, this would be a formal renunciation of the tenets of our religion. Nor can we conscientiously yield to the crown an *efficient indirect power* in these matters; because this

would be to abandon its safety. For who does not see that in such a state of things as the present, when the Minister has equivalently declared it to be his duty to do all the mischief he can to our religion; and his noble relative has pronounced, that our hierarchy must necessarily be destroyed; and when the most violent enemy of our Church in existence, has been appointed a Privy Counsellor, for the express purpose of regulating the concerns of religion, who, I say, does not see, that if the crown possessed an efficient, though indirect power, in the appointment of our prelates, we should, on every vacancy, have the most heterodox or immoral ecclesiastic, professing our communion, palmed upon us, for the purpose of betraying or of disgracing us?—Still, in my opinion, a negative power or veto, under due restrictions, may be granted, sufficient to satisfy all the fair claims of the state, and which will not expose our Church to danger under the most hostile ministers.

The mode of filling up the vacant Catholic sees in Ireland is the following. Upon the demise of a bishop, the officiating clergy, or the chapter of the diocese, meet, and choose three clergymen, *Dignus*, *Dignior*, and *Dignissimus*, whose names they send up by what is called a postulation to the metropolitan of the province in which the diocese is situated. Upon this he calls his surviving suffragan bishops to meet him in synod, where the postulation is either approved of or amended, as they, in their wisdom, think best. Application is then made to the chief pastor of the Catholic Church, for those spiritual faculties in favour of the candidates most approved of, which we deem necessary for the continuation of a divine mission from the Apostles

which prevailed in the Primitive Church during her golden ages, than any other which has since been adopted in the different ages and countries of Christianity, as is well known to learned men, who are versed in the antient canons and the writings of the Fathers, particularly of St. Cyprian, and as the unlearned may soon convince themselves, by consulting the Ecclesiastical History of Fleury In a word, it is impracticable in the existing circumstances, to take from the Catholic prelates of Ireland, the actual power which they possess over the nomination of their future colleagues. Nevertheless, loyal as they are in their principles and conduct, and bound as they are by their duty, their oaths, and their recent unanimous resolution, in their Assembly of September 14 and 15, to “adhere to their former rule of nominating no persons to the episcopal rank, but men of the most approved loyalty and peaceable conduct;” there is neither law nor reason (should a proper arrangement for this purpose be settled) against their taking information on the subject of the candidate’s loyalty, and even binding themselves to take such information, from the quarter which is best qualified and authorised to pronounce upon this subject, I mean his Majesty’s government, whether this government be friendly or hostile to them. For example, were I a Catholic bishop or metropolitan of Ireland, and were I deliberating about the merits of a certain candidate for episcopacy; as I would take information from his fellow students concerning his talents and learning, from his fellow clergymen concerning his orthodoxy, from his parishioners

concerning his morals, so I should have no difficulty of referring the question concerning his loyalty and civil principles to the King's representative. If, after a space of time to be fixed upon, suppose a fortnight or a month, for the purpose of making due enquiries, I were informed by the Secretary of the Castle, that the result of them was unfavourable to the character of the candidate *Dignissimus*, as a subject or citizen, I should expect that some discussion would take place, in order that a meritorious character might not be ruined by groundless calumny, or malicious whispering. In case, however, government persisted in its objections, I should then, after consulting with my brethren, and being authorised by them, present the name of the candidate *Dignior*. Should he also be rejected on the score of disloyalty, after some enquiry into the grounds of the specific charges against him, I should, of course, with the same formalities, offer the name of the remaining candidate *Dignus*. In case all the three candidates were thus rejected, it would be necessary for the metropolitan to give notice of the circumstance to the chapter or clergy of the vacant see, who, in consequence, would be necessitated to meet again, in order to make a fresh postulation, as the bishops of the province would be obliged to assemble, in order to decide upon it.

From the simple exposure of this plan, as accompanied with the preceding statements, the nature of the restrictions upon the veto, which would be necessary for the security of our church, clearly present themselves. First, it is requisite that the exercise of it should be confined within certain, and those narrow bounds: because the process which I have described is itself tedious;

because the number of clergymen in each diocese, who are eminently qualified in every respect to preside over *their brethren*, cannot be supposed very great ; and chiefly, because it is indispensably necessary to guard against the admission of a *virtual positive power*, under the nature of a *negative power*, and against the intrigues and corruption consequent to it. For example, if a hostile minister, after putting the *veto* upon A, B, and C, could continue it down to X and Y, he might force us to accept of his favourite Z, whom I suppose to be the very tail and disgrace of his cloth. Or (what would happen even under a friendly minister), if the crown had an unlimited veto, in point of number of times : whenever a Catholic see became vacant, twenty noblemen or gentlemen, to answer their own parliamentary purposes, would hurry up to the Castle, and would insist that their respective dependent priest should be appointed : for which purpose they would tell the Lord Lieutenant that nothing more is necessary than to make use of the *veto*, with respect to every other candidate. For a similar reason, no three candidates, nor even two candidates, ought to be presented together. Because this would be to attribute to the crown a *certain degree* of positive power, and to open a field for intrigue with respect to those individuals. Lastly, it would be necessary to stipulate that the only ground for the exercise of the *veto* should be the presumed disloyalty or sedition of the candidate, in practice or in principle.

Such, Mr. Editor, is the nature of that *limited veto*, which I endeavoured to give an idea of (though perhaps not quite so clearly and in detail as at present), to the members of parliament with whom I conversed, pre-

viously to the Catholic debate, and which I represented as calculated to obtain the sanction of the Catholic bishops of Ireland. There are copies of a short printed paper composed by me, and dated May 26, 1808, in the hands of different gentlemen, which will shew that I have not materially varied in the present exposition, from that which I made at the time of the debates. It is very possible that some of the personages whom I had the honour of then communicating with, may not have fully comprehended my meaning: and I have reason to suppose that the concessions, as they are here stated in this exposure, fall short of the idea which the public formed of them as they were first laid down. Still I am of opinion that they are calculated to afford an additional pledge of loyalty and peaceableness of our prelates, and to produce a good understanding and mutual confidence between them and the government of the country.

III. It is undoubtedly true, sir, that the prelates in question, in their late assembly held in Dublin, September 14 and 15, have declared that it is "Inexpedient to make any alteration in the present discipline with respect to the mode of nominating Catholic prelates." But I must observe, in justice to myself, that the most distinguished amongst them for the situations which they hold, have avowed to me, and I am sure are prepared to avow again—"That I had reason to expect they would sanction the limited veto." And I must observe, in justice to them, by way of obviating the suspicion and obloquy to which they are now exposed, that to my certain knowledge, they nor any of them have ever been tampered with by ministry, or by any other persons, to disgrace their parliamentary advocates; much less, that they or

any of them are actuated by those factious motives, which there is too much reason to impute to some of their countrymen, who are the most averse from the concession of the *veto*, or indeed by any other motives than a regard for the security of their religion, as they understand them. Lastly, I observe, though there is hardly need of observing it, that the very term "*inexpedient*," as contradistinguished from impossible and unlawful, shews that the resolution in question does not contain any irrevocable doctrine, or immutable discipline of their church. And the explanations on this subject by the titular Primate, Dr. O'Reilly, in his official letter to Lord Southwell and Sir Edward Bellew, lately published in most of the newspapers, distinctly states, that he is certain his fellow prelates entertained no such meaning of the term in forming their resolution, and that, in his mind, it refers only to *existing circumstances*. Now circumstances may obviously vary, and would thereby alter the *inexpediency* on which the resolution itself was formed.

It is not for me, sir, to pronounce upon the resolutions of a numerous prelacy, who have honoured me with their commission, when deciding upon a question which they consider as exclusively regarding the Catholic Episcopacy of their island; but as they have incurred a great deal of public censure, and are liable, in the course of two months, to incur a great deal more, it is an act of justice due to them, to state such motives of their determination as I have occasionally collected from their conversation. This is a subject also, upon which the public has repeatedly called for information. The following, then, is the substance of the language which I have at different times heard amongst them :—

“ Why are we Catholics, of all descriptions of subjects, not communicating with the Established Church, called upon to admit of an interference on the part of government in the election of our chief pastors? Government does not ask to interfere in the appointment of Presbyterian moderators, elders, or deacons; nor in that of Moravian or Wesleyan bishops; nor in that of the Antinomian methodistical preachers; nor in that of the Jewish priests and lectors; some of whom, for reasons which we can assign, stand more in need of additional bonds upon them than we do. If it be said, that we possess influence over our people; do not all the above-mentioned ministers of religion possess influence over their respective flocks in common with ourselves? If on this precise account the King ought to appoint our bishops, then he ought, *à fortiori*, to appoint the Grand Master, and the other Masters of the Free-Masons, the Directors of the East-India Company, and of the Bank, &c. In short, the Constitution ought to be destroyed, and a pure Despotism established in its place.

“ We are told, that the crown wishes to have the power of a *вето* in the appointment of our prelates. Now the crown actually possesses this power at present; since we, its sworn subjects, are bound in duty and by our oaths, and by a new resolution which we have just passed, to “ nominate no persons to the Episcopacy but men of unimpeachable loyalty and peaceableness;” and to shew that we are better judges in this matter than government itself is, we affirm, that the only individual of our body during the space of thirty years, that is, since we have been known to the public, upon the first relaxation of the penal laws, whose conduct has been im-

peached upon this head, is also the only individual who was appointed at the recommendation of government, namely, of a minister of high rank who is now at the head of his Majesty's councils. But what is most to the purpose, we have proved our loyalty in the most critical moments of public danger, when hostile fleets and armies have been upon our coasts, and when rebellion has raged among our deluded people. If it is proved, that any other description of clergy, in times of riot, sedition, or rebellion, has exerted themselves more zealously, disinterestedly, or successfully, than we have done, we are content to be subject to new and exclusive pledges of loyalty.

“ But what principally affects us, is the apprehension that advantage will be taken of us in any new convention which may be proposed, to extort a great deal more from us than we can possibly grant, even to save our lives. We think we perceive a disposition in our friends to raise their demands; and we remember the fable of the axe-head, which applied to the forest for a saplin to make a handle of, and having obtained that, laid all the lofty trees prostrate. There is the greater reason for caution, on our part, as we have so often been deceived by men in power. At the time of the Union, in particular, what solemn and magnificent promises were not made us, particularly by a Noble Lord, who now stands high in the ministry, in case we would promote it. We performed our part honestly and successfully; but what is become of the promises of government? What language does it now hold to us?

“ And why, after all, should we commit ourselves upon questions of such vital importance to our religion,

by making concessions to the crown, when the crown itself does not call for these concessions, but tells us plainly, that it will enter into no negotiation whatever with us, and when the best recommendation to its favours is a determined opposition to us?

“ Lastly, we find, that a vast majority of our people is decidedly against the concession, insomuch that we should lose their confidence and our influence over them, were we at present to sanction it. Now it cannot be the wish of our parliamentary friends, or of Ministers themselves, that we should be deprived of an influence which we have heretofore employed with so much success for the public safety and peace.”

Such, sir, I can assure you, is the substance of language which I have, from time to time, heard from one or other of the prelates who formed the resolution so much objected to. If it is not received in full excuse, I think it will be accepted of in extenuation of the decision by those persons of candour who expected, as I myself most certainly did, one of a different tenor. With respect to the last-mentioned argument, which probably will be considered as the strongest of the whole, I must remark, that the ferment which has prevailed among the lower and middle orders of the people on the subject of the veto, was excited partly by inflamed reports of the parliamentary debates in the newspapers, which represented the concession as *a virtual acknowledgement of the King's spiritual supremacy*; and partly by the manœuvres of a powerful party in Dublin, who considered the measure of laying the foundation of a future good understanding and confidence between the Catholic clergy and government, as an attempt to strike the sceptre of

that power, which they claim over the minds of the Catholic public out of their hands. They accordingly revenged themselves upon me, though only a subordinate minister in the business, by torrents of abuse, which they continued to pour out against me in the *Dublin Evening Herald*, during the months of August and September last, and at length by impeaching me, in their Parliament of Pimlico, as a "hired emissary of the Minister," and by sentencing me to be hanged and burnt in effigy*. I trust, however, that neither hope nor fear, that neither bribery nor persecution, will make me swerve, in my humble sphere, from the proper line of my duty as a faithful subject, and an orthodox Catholic, by "*giving to Cæsar the things which belong to Cæsar, and to God the things which belong to God.*"

I am, &c.

JOHN MILNER.

Wolverhampton, Nov. 13, 1808.

* See Dublin Evening Herald for September 26.

APPENDIX, No. III

A LETTER FROM DR. WILNER, TO THE EDITOR OF
THE DUBLIN HERALD; AND PUBLISHED IN THE
ORTHODOX-CHURCHMAN'S MAGAZINE FOR OCTOBER
1808.

SIR,

I HOPE it will not be understood that I acquiesce in the imputation of a *crime too bad to be named*: of sacrificing the principles, tenets, and rights, of the Episcopacy; if I still decline answering the queries put to me by your correspondents Sarsfield and Laicus, concerning my late communications with our advocates in parliament, and concerning the conduct of Dr. Troy, Dr. O'Reilly, and other Catholic prelates in 1799. (See the Herald for August 31, and September 2.)

I have always understood, sir, that it is highly indecorous to commit to the press any account of a conversation held with another gentleman concerning business of importance, without the revision or consent of that gentleman. Certain it is that I have lately experienced such to be the sense of the higher ranks of society in an instance relative to the matter in question. Now, it is not in my power to communicate at all with the illustrious personages alluded to at the present time, and I have great doubt whether at any future time I could obtain their consent to the desired publication. It would evidently be still more indecorous, it would even be a crime *too bad to be named*, were I to betray the confidence of

the venerable prelates whose business I so lately transacted. Laicus complains that they themselves have thought proper to keep him in the dark with respect to it, and he applies to me, their confidential agent, to inform him of it!

Independently of this, how can it be expected of me, who write, as I always have written, for the public *under my own name*, to answer the interrogatories put to me in the newspapers by writers who think proper to observe the strictest incognito themselves, and who question me upon points of the utmost delicacy and importance. They may be Catholics of the most exemplary piety who are actuated by the purest zeal for their religion, or they may be mere nominal Catholics, a disgrace by their principles and conduct to the religion they profess; they may even be *wolves in sheeps' clothing* who come only to kill and destroy, for any thing I can know of them. The disclosure of their real names would probably settle my opinions upon these points, and enable me to decide how far they are deserving of my respect and regard. It is true they profess to interrogate me in the name of the Catholic body: but where are their credentials for the high character they assume?—Indeed the very idea of an anonymous representative or agent, is perfectly ridiculous.

Another reason for my refusing to answer them is, that this would evidently lead to an exceedingly long and unprofitable controversy. For I find, sir, that they and I do not agree in first principles, concerning the constitution and government of the Catholic Church. One of them, in the avowed character of a *layman*, talks of his *rights* in the appointment of bishops—the other denies the *possibility*

of my receiving any authority relative to this matter from the prelates (notwithstanding its being wholly and exclusively in their hands) because I did not receive it *also from laymen and inferior priests*.—Now, sir, these are not the lessons which I have learned from the canons and the fathers, from Bellarmine, Thomassenus, Van Espen, De Marca, Cabassutius, and other modern doctors: nor are they the lessons which I have taught in those works which these very gentlemen are pleased to commend as containing the “principles and tenets of the Roman Catholic Church, the purity of its discipline, and the divine right of its episcopacy,” namely, *the Letter on the appointment of Bishops, the divine Right of Episcopacy, and Ecclesiastical Democracy detected*. Nor are your correspondents, sir, better informed concerning modern matters of fact, relative to the present business, than they are concerning the theory and the ancient and present practice of the Church in recruiting the episcopacy. One of them, Sarsfield, addressing Dr. O’Reilly in your *Herald* some weeks ago, with equal gravity on his part, and contumely to me, thanks the prelate in the name of the Catholic body for the pretended seasonable reproof which he had addressed to me on the subject of the debates in parliament. Now it is a fact that there is not one word of reproof, or even of complaint against me in the letter in question, which is still in my possession; but, on the contrary, every expression of regard and esteem which friendship would dictate. Again, it is evident that the writers give implicit faith to the accounts of negligent, drowsy, tippling, and ignorant reporters, concerning the late debates which they have seen in the newspapers. It is likewise plain that they make no allowance whatever for

the unguarded and unwarranted expressions and arguments of the orators themselves. Now it is a fact which I can aver, as having attended the whole of the debates in both houses, that the speeches themselves are most incorrectly and unfaithfully published in most of the newspapers; that the orators themselves did not by any means proceed so far in their unwarranted concessions as they are reported to have gone, and that they made subsequent explanations of what they had actually said, of great importance, which are not at all noticed in the newspapers. I may add, in justice to them as well as to myself, that, after the debate was over, they acknowledged themselves to have advanced certain positions, the most alarming of all that were made, for which they had no warrant but their own way of viewing the subject. It is probable that your correspondents will again tell me that my account of this matter is evasive and unsatisfactory; but it is all that I can give, in the existing circumstances, consistently with honour and duty. If in consequence of this omission, I must forfeit popularity, as these writers threaten me, my determined answer to the threat is, *Let me perform my duties still—and then let popularity follow if she will.* Such has been my way of thinking and acting throughout life in England, which is the cause of whatever little popularity I have met with in Ireland.

But though I am resolved not to betray the confidence of others, I have no objection to declare my own sentiments on the grand subject of debate, because I am not declaring any thing which I actually agreed upon on the part of the prelates, not having in fact authority so to do, and because having no claim to take part in their deliberations, I am not anticipating them. My object is

barely to dissipate that mist of error and calumny, and that consequent scandal which has been industriously collected around it, to my great injury.

I wish then most earnestly for the Emancipation of the Catholics of Ireland, and this not so much to please a few noblemen and gentlemen in parliament, as to make the poor peasant's cabin his castle, so that he may no longer be liable to have it burnt down in his midnight slumbers, or be otherwise exposed to illegal violence, or cruel oppression. When this is effected, I shall confidently expect to see the Irish cabin smile with all the comforts of the English cottage; but to effect it, the wall of legal separation between the different religions must be destroyed to its foundations, and all must enjoy the benefits of the constitution upon equal terms. To obtain this, I would not indeed sacrifice one atom of the tenets or essential discipline of the Catholic Church. I would not even expose these to the remotest danger, or do any thing which should not obtain the entire approbation of the Apostolic See; but I would do that which is perfectly lawful, perfectly safe, that which the Apostolic See has agreed to in other countries of a different communion, and what I have reason to believe she would agree to in our own. To be brief, I should have no objection, if I were a prelate of the Catholic Church of Ireland, after I had in conjunction with my brethren agreed, who were the three clergymen most proper to be recommended to the Pope for episcopal powers in the usual way, to ask government, whether they knew any thing against the loyalty of the first person upon the list. For I never would allow it the *Positive Right* of choosing even one among the three, who had been previously approved of by myself and

my brethren. If government answered in the affirmative, it would be incumbent upon them to substantiate their charge; the consequence of which would be, I may safely say, in every case, that the candidate's character would be cleared of the unjust imputation, or rather that no objection would be made against him at all. If any one however is willing to suppose that government would be so unjust to itself, as well as to the Catholics, as to object in succession to all the three candidates, here I conceive its negative power must necessarily end: for I repeat it, I would rather lose my life than consent to an uncatholic government's obtaining any actual power, or such a negative power as might grow into actual power, in any portion of the Catholic Church, however desirous I am that the loyalty and civism of our prelates with respect to their king and country should be ascertained and publicly recognised, for the greater good of their flocks. On the other hand, I trust in God, that there always will be as many as four parish priests, or other inferior clergymen in Ireland, worthy and qualified in every respect to wield the crosier. But, says Sarsfield, in a former letter, "would it not be an injustice to exclude a single individual—an O'Leary for example, from the highest dignity to his profession, in consequence of the unjust prejudices of government." I answer, that the benefit of the pastor must be subservient to that of his flock; and that the inconveniency in question exists in every Christian country, and that an O'Leary himself would not be recommended to the Apostolical See for episcopal powers, nor, if he were recommended, would he obtain them at the present moment, were it clearly understood that he was a man obnoxious to government. Of so great conse-

quence is it for the benefit of the faithful, that their pastor should be duly protected and respected by the civil power. This, sir, is not lightly said, and I have the most convincing document now before me, asserting it.

To conclude, as disunion and dissensions have been the chief causes of the suffering of Irish Catholics, so it is evident, their common concern can never prosper until they are, at least to a certain degree, united. I have the best grounds for believing that the Catholic prelates are and will continue to be perfectly united in sentiment and co-operation, notwithstanding the pains which have been taken to sow dissensions among them. This affords the pleasing confidence that unity will at least be preserved where it is most of all necessary. But why these unnatural animosities; why these bitter reproaches; why these violent threats among the lay Catholics of different classes and of different parts of Ireland, to the exultation of the new privy counsellor "and the laugh of hell?" For what can the Catholic religion itself avail us, if it be not to save our souls!

J. MILNER.

Cork, Sept. 8, 1808.

APPENDIX, No. IV.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE IRISH CATHOLIC PRELATES.

The following article appeared in the Dublin Journal of the 19th September, 1808:

“ The two following Resolutions have been agreed to by the Roman Catholic Prelates, assembled at present in this city.”

“ It is the decided opinion of the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland, that it is inexpedient to introduce any alteration in the canonical mode hitherto observed in the nomination of the Irish Roman Catholic bishops, which mode long experience has proved to be unexceptionable, wise, and salutary.

“ That the Roman Catholic prelates pledge themselves to adhere to the rules by which they have hitherto been uniformly guided; namely, to recommend to his Holiness only such persons as are of unimpeachable loyalty, and peaceable conduct.”

APPENDIX, No. V.

EXTRACTS FROM MR. CORBETT'S REPORTS OF THE
PARLIAMENTARY DEBATES ON THE CATHOLIC
QUESTION IN MAY, 1808.

VOL. XI.—PAGE 556.

MR. GRATTAN.—“It has been argued, *and with much force*, that the power of the Pope in the nomination of the bishops may be considered of a dangerous tendency. With respect to this power, the Catholics themselves nominate the bishop; the Pope gives him a spiritual capacity. If gentlemen think this a dangerous power, why, then, *I have a proposition to make, a proposition which the Catholics have authorised me to name*. It is this, that in the future nomination of bishops, his Majesty may interfere, and exercise his royal privilege, by putting a negative upon such nomination; *that is, in other words, to say: That no Catholic bishop shall be appointed without the entire approbation of his Majesty.*”

PAGE 557.

“Here then is a power to *be vested* in his Majesty, which must operate to do away the danger complained of, by destroying the influence of Buonaparte, if such influence exists.”

“ The proposition will make a double connection, the two Churches will be as one, and the King at the head ; by this means all danger will be removed, the *moral* and *political* entirety of his Majesty’s dominions will be established ; the constitution will be invigorated and strengthened, by connecting the Catholics with the parliament, and the King with the Catholic clergy, by the interference which he must of course exercise in consequence of the appointment.”

PAGE 597.

SIR J. COX HIPPESELEY.—“ Dr. Milner was himself a prelate of the Roman communion, and was *formally accredited to this country by those prelates as the organ of their sentiments, to treat in their behalf, if any such treaty became necessary, and to propose or assent to such measures as might eventually be connected with the objects of the present important discussion.* A proposition, stated by his Right Hon. Friend who moved the question, and certainly of the greatest importance, *had been introduced into the House on the authority of Dr. Milner.*”

MR. PONSONBY.—“ It was said there was no alteration of circumstances since the question was last discussed in parliament ; now I conceive that there is the *greatest alteration of circumstances that could possibly have taken place*, and these circumstances could not be known to the house nor to the people of England ; *the circumstance the most weighty is the connection subsisting between the clergy and the See of Rome ; for, by giving the Pope a power over the Catholic clergy, and the government no controul over them, then they would in fact be putting the superior orders of clergy under a foreign*

power, falling under the dominion of France. The Catholics considered amongst themselves, and they determined to give to the government every information upon the subject, and to make their superior clergy subject to the crown. When a Catholic bishop in Ireland dies, the other bishops in that province in which the diocese of the deceased is situated meet, and conferring amongst themselves, they fix upon three persons whom they think the most fit to succeed him. They send these names to have the approbation of the Pope, for, according to the Catholic faith, it is impossible for certain offices to be performed but by appointment from the Pope, as if by the immediate delegation of Christ himself; now they have agreed, when the names are returned, to send them to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and if he should object to all the three, they strike them out and send other three in their stead, until the King's approbation of some one of them be received. Even then they send that name to Rome to receive the approbation of the Pope. This, however, is giving the REAL AND EFFECTUAL NOMINATION to the crown; and this being the case, will any man say this is cultivating through Rome an intercourse with France for traitorous purposes?"

PAGE 619.

MR. PONSONBY.—“ Answered (Mr. Yorke) that he made the statement upon the authority of Dr. Milner, who was a Catholic bishop in this country, and who was authorised by the Catholic bishops of Ireland to make the proposition in case the measure of Catholic Emancipation

should be acceded to. The proposition was this : that the person to be nominated to any vacant bishopric should be submitted to the King's approbation, and, if the approbation was refused, another person should be proposed, and so on in succession, until his Majesty's approbation should be obtained, *so that the appointment should finally rest with the King."*

PAGE 649.

LORD GRENVILLE.—“ If you tolerate the Roman Catholic Church, which is episcopal, you must, of course allow it to have its bishops. *But it is unquestionably proper, that the Crown should exercise an effectual negative over the appointment of the persons called to execute those functions ; to this the Catholics of Ireland declare themselves perfectly willing to accede."*

“ To me (this declaration) is not new. I always felt the propriety of providing for this point.”

PAGE 686.

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK.—“ Adverting to the power of rejecting their bishops, which the Catholics were willing to give his Majesty, he explained it more fully.—*They were disposed to lay before his Majesty a list of three persons, of whom his Majesty was to be at liberty to reject two ; the remaining one would be invested with the episcopal dignity, but if his Majesty were to reject the whole three, then another list of three distinct persons would be submitted to his consideration, and so on UNTIL HIS Majesty should signify his approbation of any individual by allowing his name to remain."*

LORD GRENVILLE, in reply—"The proposition relative to the future appointment of Catholic bishops in Ireland was, to his knowledge, long in contemplation, although the Catholics had not until lately thought proper to make it public; it was a proposition indeed known to his Right Hon. Friend, now no more, (Mr. Pitt,) and was one of those guards and conditions with which he meant to accompany the concessions which he proposed to grant to the Catholic body. With regard to the nature of the proposition itself, he should rather think that instead of presenting the names of three persons to the King for his Majesty to choose one from among them, as had been mentioned, it would be more eligible to present but one name, and if that was rejected, another, and so on in succession until his Majesty's approbation should be obtained."

APPENDIX, No. VI.

EXTRACT from the DUBLIN JOURNAL of the 24th of
November, 1808.

THE Public may have observed that we have very cautiously avoided entering into the merits of the dispute subsisting between the Roman Catholic prelates of Ireland and the opposition leaders in parliament—" *non nobis tantas componere lites* :"—which body has deceived or been deceived, we do not enquire; but in the heat of the controversy (as it will sometimes happen), things have escaped which it may be of public service to fix and record. Amongst these an extraordinary piece of casuistry, published by the titular Roman Catholic bishop of Ossory, appears to be deserving high consideration: this reverend person had, it seems, been charged by a Roman Catholic gentleman of some leading in Kilkenny, with a breach of promise, to which charge the prelate has replied in the following explanation:—so little, however, to the satisfaction of the gentleman complaining, that he has even urged this very argument as an additional ground for placing in the power of the crown some check upon the appointment of the bishops of his own communion. How far he may be justified in this notion, our readers will judge;—but we cannot help on our part apprehending, that the doctrines broached by his Reve-

rence are precisely those for practising which the order of Jesuits became obnoxious.

“ An advertisement appeared in the *Leinster Journal* of last Saturday, signed “ George Bryan,” in which I am charged with the breach of a solemn promise. A public attack of this kind necessarily calls on any man to justify his conduct, if in his power. A plain narrative of facts, as they happened, and an explanation of the motives on which I acted, will complete this justification, I hope, in the eyes of any impartial man.

“ 1st. I acknowledge, that I *promised* to some gentlemen of the committee, that I would sign these addresses, when some lines, to which I objected, would be expunged;—but I utterly deny having made any *solemn* promise, if by a solemn promise Mr. Bryan means any thing more than a ‘ serious promise.’ For nothing in actions, expressions, or writing, was superadded to the verbal declaration I made of signing the addresses when corrected. The nature of the case did not at all require a solemn promise! and the gentlemen who presented these addresses to me, had too much sagacity and judgement, to alarm my suspicions by such a proposal; for the consequence would probably be, a rejection of the addresses on the spot.

“ 2dly. Some days elapsed before the corrected addresses were again brought to me to be signed. In this interval, many of the clergy and laity, of this city, came to me, and remonstrated against my signing these addresses. They urged, that these addresses were calculated to pass an indirect censure on the proceedings of the prelates in Dublin, and to diminish the respect due to their late resolutions; that they were preparatory steps to the con-

cession of a veto to the government, in the nomination of the Catholic prelates of Ireland, and that a general dislike and disapprobation of these addresses, prevailed among the great majority of the priests and Catholic laity of the city. When I ascertained the last fact, I resolved not to sign the addresses, and was at the same time persuaded that I was guilty of no sin or crime by such a refusal.

“ I am convinced that a serious, sincere, and voluntary promise binds a man, who makes it, under the pain of sin, to fulfil it. But, I am likewise convinced, that the obligation arising from a promise, ceases in the following cases;—

“ 1st. If a man promises a thing impossible. For no man can be bound to do a thing impossible to be done.

“ 2dly. If a man promises to do any thing sinful or unlawful. For no promise, though confirmed with an oath, can bind a man to commit sin.

“ 3dly. When a person, in whose favour a promise is made, releases the promiser from the promise he has made.

“ 4thly. When a man promises a thing pernicious or useless to the person in whose favour the promise is made.

“ 5thly. *When before the promise is fulfilled the circumstances become so changed, that the person promising, had he foreseen those circumstances, would never have made the promise.* On this case I rest my justification. For had I foreseen or known that my signing these addresses would produce such alarm or consternation, such dislike and disapprobation, as I afterwards found they would. in the minds of the great majority of the Catho-

the priests and laity of this city, I would by no means have consented to sign them.—St. Thomas* says, ‘that a man is not guilty of an untruth in such a case; because, when he promised, he intended to perform his promise; nor is he unfaithful to his promise, because the circumstances are changed afterwards.’—This is not only the opinion of St. Thomas, but is also the opinion of all the theologians and canonists I ever saw or read.

“JAMES LANIGAN.”

“*Kilkenny, Nov. 1808.*”

* Certainly not the Apostle.

**Brettell and Co. Printers,
Marshall-Street, Golden-Square.**

LETTER

WILLIAM WILBERFORCE, Esq. M.P.

THE SECOND BILL.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

AND

ORDERED TO BE PRINTED ON 1st FEBRUARY, 1810

• FOR

REGISTERING CHARITABLE DONATIONS, &c.

BY A. HIGHMORE, GENT.

PRINTED AT THE DESIRE OF THE COMMITTEES OF GOVERNORS OF
THE SMALL POX HOSPITALS AND CITY OF LONDON LYING-IN
HOSPITALS }
•

LONDON.

PRINTED BY R. WILKS, 89, CHANCERY-LANE

1810

Speedily will be published,

BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

DEDICATED, BY PERMISSION, TO

THE KING.

PIETAS LONDINENSIS.

THE HISTORY, DESIGN, AND PRESENT STATE OF THE

PUBLIC CHARITIES

IN AND NEAR LONDON.

TO

W. WILBERFORCE, Esq. M. P.

SIR,

I trust that the cause of the Charities which will be concerned in the regulations of the new Bill for registering Charitable Donations as printed on 19th February, 1810, will plead my excuse for again venturing to trespass on your patience to examine the following objections in addition to those submitted to you in my Observations on the former Bill, which chiefly applied to a Transfer of their Capital to the Custos Rotulorum, which has been relinquished by the present Bill.*

By the first clause, the word "Charity" seems to intend Institutions of Charity ; and which, (not to dwell on the epithets which do not all apply to them, or to Donations, or to the verb

being in the plural number, or to the variance between the title and the provisions) directs the registry of all Deeds, Wills, or other Instruments, by which they have been or shall be founded or encreased, &c. These words comprehend every Instrument, however important or trifling, (which I shall endeavour to enumerate, page 9), anyways affecting the foundation and encrease of any Charity. The multiplicity and extent of the deposit, the great expence to the several Charities, the danger of removing them to the proper office, and the injury probably to be sustained during the delay of their registry, combine many obvious objections which require due consideration before this Bill is pursued and passed into a Law.

Besides ; many Instruments will in a course of years have been superseded by others, become useless in their operation, and have been cancelled or entirely destroyed without any attested Copies having been taken or any minute made of their Contents ; and to register these would be useless if they could be found. In Trust Deeds of Stock, it frequently happens, that where Trustees die or relinquish their trust, when further Capitals are invested, or part of them disposed of, by the order of

General Meetings, the necessary Transfers are the subject of several Indorsements, until the parchment being full, a new Deed comprising the whole is prepared, and the old one is cancelled. Surely it can answer very little purpose to register this, except to encrease the Registrar's fees, at the expence of the Charity. The purchase Deeds of any Estates are necessarily enrolled according to the Mortmain Act of 9 Geo. II. c. 36. in the Court of Chancery ; and those of Lands, in the Counties of Middlesex and York, are by the statute of Queen Anne, registered in those Counties already : a further registry of them under this Bill will likewise encrease the expence without a corresponding utility.

The proposed memorial is not guarded against Stamp Duty, and although the present duty upon those for Annuities, and for Estates in Middlesex and York, does not apply to the intended registry, yet unless exempted, these would become the subject of any future Stamp Act, which would augment the expence complained of.

The third clause provides, that where the poor persons shall not be wholly in one county, notice is to be sent to the Clerk of the Peace,

“ of each other County within which the residence of such poor persons shall be.” The obscurity of this provision, as it may affect Charities in London, deserves much consideration. Many of them are instituted for the admission and relief of the sick, all of whom are unconnected with each other, and come from different parts; as for instance, the Small Pox Hospital, at Pancras, in Middlesex, receives patients daily in the Casual Small Pox, others for Inoculation *in* the hospital, and others for Vaccination as *out* patients. They come from London, Middlesex, Herts, Essex, Surry, and Kent, and I have known them come for Inoculation by the waggon from Oxford. Now this clause is so worded, that any Deed, Will, or other Instrument, by which this Charity was founded or ever increased or benefited, must be registered in Middlesex, and notice of that voluminous registry sent to the Clerk of the Peace in every one of those Counties where such poor persons “shall be.” For Hospitals and Charities are not limited to their own Vicinity; they receive patients from all parts. The Bill is not satisfied with this multifarious registry in the County where the Hospital or Charity is situate, but requires a corresponding entry to be made in the Counties of all its patients not even in the adjoining County only.

But many patients are sent to Hospitals from on Ship board, upon and after their arrival on our Coasts, and in the river Thames ; this is frequently the case at the London Hospital ; and also at the Small Pox Hospital ; many young and healthy subjects take disorders and Small Pox readily upon their arrival, and in that situation are sent to these Hospitals ; particularly to the latter, casual Small Pox patients, and many Lascars and other Seamen from India, are sent by the Hon. East India Company. After their recovery they are returned to their Ships, and proceed thence on their return home. It will, Sir, be difficult for the Conductors of these Charities to know how to obey this Clause, and find any Clerk of the Peace to whom they can give notice for the registry required ; and it will therefore be equally difficult for a Trustee to know how to avoid the Fangs of a common Informer, who by the penal clause is entitled to harrass him with an information for this neglect of duty which it was not in his power to perform.

Indeed it is not easy to decipher the full meaning of the expression in this Bill, " where such poor persons shall be". for it is so material to them to save the payment of rent, that when they are taken ill, or when pregnant

women are near the time of their delivery, and have no children, and their husband absent in the army or navy, or have recently died, they quit their lodgings before they go to any Hospital, and take the chance, or perhaps never mean to return to them at their discharge. So that at their admission to any Hospital, they cease to be of that place from whence they came ; the difficulty of such an enquiry therefore as shall ascertain this fact and the consequent numerous registries are obvious and immense, and the utility not apparent; and what Trustee will or can be expected to take the trouble ?

The proviso, that where the poor persons are not mentioned in the Deed by any local description, the registry is to be in the County of the Donor or Testator, limits the registry to a narrower compass than the words at the opening of the clause, which pursues the general terms of the first clause. In Legacies to Charities, so in Deeds of Trust for them, the poor persons who are the objects are not mentioned, but the Gift or Trust is declared for the benefit or to carry on the good designs of the Charity. A doubt is therefore created by the ambiguity of this proviso, whether the registry should be in the County where the

Hospital or Charity stands, or is administered or dispensed, as comprising the whole of the poor persons intended, or where they have resided, or in that county only where any testator resided at the time of his death. Your more attentive study of the language of this clause will, perhaps, avoid the subjecting innocent parties to the danger of undeserved penalties.

By the next clause, "any trustees, executors, and administrators, of or acting *under* any deed, will, &c." are subjected to a penalty for so acting if the deeds, &c. have not been registered: in such cases as Mr. Hetherington's, Mr. Stock's, and Mr. Came's trusts for blind persons, and many others, trustees act *under* the authorities of a deed or will; courts of assistants of livery companies, and every member of committees of charities, who administer benefactions, vested in or committed to them by deed or will, &c. &c. are here rendered liable for acting, unless those deeds and wills, and every other instrument, order, power of attorney, petition, certificate of qualification of pensioners, decrees, assignments of shares and interests, releases and discharges, &c. &c. all which, and many more, are comprised under the word "instruments," are all registered. The most intelligent clerk or solicitor will

scarcely be able to secure them from prosecution ; for after he supposes he has done all, some useless memorandum may be fixed upon to entitle an informer to sue every one of those gentlemen. This, as far as I can learn from general conversation abroad, is the most obnoxious part of this Bill ; and on this I ventured to suggest very briefly some remarks in my Observations on the former Bill. I foresee great difficulty in procuring any gentlemen to be trustees, whose sanction, confidence, and patronage, are of essential moment to the progress of useful Institutions of Charity, if they shall be thus subject to be harrassed by a common informer for penalties which shall be innocently incurred by them, and scarcely in their power to avoid ; they will feel that to withdraw from all Charities is their only security, for it cannot be expected that they should saddle themselves with the trouble of this numerous registry, the mere preparation for which is sufficient to employ several clerks ; and thus they will be rather led to relinquish trusts which have hitherto flourished under their direction, and the property and management will at last sink into the hands of merely official or self-interested men. A more effectual method to curb national Charity, in an age when it is most useful, could not have been devised ; for

an ignorant officer of a Charity may thus involve them in penalties, or an artful one may be tempted to omit the registry of one of the instruments, or one of the many notices here prescribed, in order to reap a share of the ignominious spoil. It may be asked, what claim has any Charity on its trustees? They are all its benefactors, bestowing their donations and yielding their time gratuitously to inspect and carry on its progress, without which its utility to the poor would be lost. Why should such men be rendered liable to personal attack and pecuniary fine with full costs? it would seem a far more consistent measure, if the Bill is to be passed, that the person guilty of the neglect should be subjected to the penalty: and the Statute for licensing lying-in hospitals, 13 Geo. III. c. 82. sect. 10. is in point, and offers a legislative example for this case, where the duty of seeing the oath administered to their patients is charged upon the owner, master, secretary, clerk, or other person, entrusted with the care and management of those Charities: had that Statute imposed this duty upon trustees, it would have operated almost as a prohibition to such useful and humane institutions!

In the clause for calling in sums lent at in-

terest, there is no exemption of such charities as are formed for that express purpose.

In the exempting clause, the quakers, the livery companies, the charities invested by the Jews, Roman Catholics, Protestant Dissenters, Methodists, religious sects, and those of many trades which have no local establishment whose pensions are distributed to poor persons in all parts of the kingdom, of which sort are the above-mentioned funds for the blind, are all omitted: but which have a just claim to the indulgence of the legislature, and offer no apparent cause why they should be made subject to such difficulties and penal restrictions as have been stated. Moreover, the trustees of those charities which are wholly applied in fixed pensions will probably be obliged next year to reduce their amount, in order to defray the charges which will be incurred by the requisitions of this Bill.

After all, sir, there runs throughout this Bill an ambiguity of language, and a want of that legal precision which is always necessary in any penal statute; which conveys the impression that something more is intended than is expressed; this has contributed to excite an alarm in the minds of many who devote themselves ge-

acrossly to the cause of charity, and to every exertion to ameliorate the condition of the poor ; and thus the remedy which is presumed in the preamble to the Bill will ultimately be defeated by their withdrawing from this great source of national service.

I trust, sir, that your candour will weigh these points, will excuse this second intrusion, and will allow me to hope, that if this Bill be not wholly withdrawn, it will be so modified as to relieve the public anxiety, either by some special or general exemptions.

I have the honour to be,

with great respect,

Sir, &c.

A. HIGHMORE.

5th March, 1810, Ely Place.

COPY OF THE BILL

FOR

THE REGISTERING AND SECURING OF
CHARITABLE DONATIONS FOR THE
BENEFIT OF POOR PERSONS IN *ENG-
LAND*.

*Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed
on 19th Feb. 1810.*

WHEREAS Charitable Donations have been Preamble.
given for the benefit of poor persons in *Eng-
land* and *Wales* to a very considerable amount,
and many of the said Donations appear to have
been lost, and others, from neglect of payment,
and the inattention of those persons who ought
to superintend them, are in danger of being
lost, or rendered very difficult to be preserved ;

1. BE IT THEREFORE ENACTED, &c. Deeds, &c.
That all Deeds, Wills, and other Instruments respecting
whereby any Charity or any Charitable Dona- Charitable
tions for the benefit of any poor persons in Donations to
any place in *England* or *Wales* have been, or be registered
shall be founded, established, made, benefited
or increased, shall from and after
be registered in the Office of the
Clerk of the Peace of the County within
which such poor persons shall be situate.

Register
Books to be
provided.

Form of the
Registry.

2. That for the purpose of registering such Deeds, Wills, and other Instruments, immediately after the passing of this Act, and from time to time afterwards as there shall be occasion, the Clerk of the Peace shall provide proper Books of Parchment, Vellum, or good and durable Paper, wherein all such Deeds, Wills, and other Instruments shall be registered, and every page thereof shall be marked at the top with the figure of the number of every such page, beginning at the second leaf with number one; and in such books there shall, in the form contained in the Schedule to this Act annexed, be registered and written in words at length the date of, and the names and descriptions of, the parties to, or makers of all such Deeds, Wills, and other Instruments, and also so much of all such Deeds, Wills, and other Instruments, as shall directly or expressly relate to the Charities or Charitable Donations thereby founded, established, made, benefited, or increased, for the support or benefit of poor persons in any place within the County, and such registries shall be signed by the respective Clerks of the Peace of the said Courts, or their Deputies or Chief Clerks, and also by the Trustees, Executors, or Administrators, Trustee, Executor or Administrator, or his, her, or their Receiver or Agent causing the said registries to be made; and when and so often as any such entries shall be made, the said Clerks of the Peace or their

Deputies or Chief Clerks respectively, shall enter or write, or cause to be written, in words at length, in an alphabetical Index at the end of such books, the names or titles of the several Trusts, and also the names of the several places for the benefit of the poor persons whereof the Charities or Charitable Donations mentioned in such entries have been founded, made, enlarged or increased; and all books provided as aforesaid shall be carefully kept and preserved for public use and inspection in the Office to which they shall belong.

3. That in case the poor persons to be benefited by any such Charity or Charitable Donation as aforesaid shall not be wholly within any one County, then and in such case every Deed, Will, or other Instrument whereby such Charity or Charitable Donation shall be founded, established, made, benefited or increased, shall be registered in manner aforesaid in the Office of the Clerk of the Peace of any one County within which part of the same poor persons shall be, as to the Trustees, Executors, or Administrators, Trustee, Executor, or Administrator of such Deed, Will, or other Instrument, shall seem most convenient; and notice in writing of the registry of such Deed, Will, or other Instrument, containing such specifications as are hereinbefore directed to be entered in the same alphabetical Index, shall be given by the party or parties causing such

Where Charities are in more than one County, they may be registered in either.

Registry to be made, to the Clerk of the Peace for each other County within which the residue of the same poor persons shall be, which Registrar upon receiving such notice, shall forthwith enter and write, or cause to be entered and written, a copy of such notice in the Register Book to be provided as aforesaid, and every such entry shall be signed by the respective Clerks of the Peace, or their Deputies or Chief Clerks making or causing the same to be made, and also by the person or persons giving such notice as aforesaid; and when and so often as any such entry shall be made, the said Clerks of the Peace or their Deputies or Chief Clerks respectively, shall write, or cause to be written, in words at length, in an alphabetical Index at the end of the book in which such entry shall be made, the name or title of the Trust, and the names of the several places for the benefit of the poor persons whereof the Charity or Charitable Donation mentioned in such entry has been founded, established, made, benefited or increased, and also the name of the Office and County wherein the Deed, Will, or other Instrument referred to in such notice has been registered: Provided always, that when the poor persons for whom or whose use any such Charitable Donation or Legacy is or shall be given or bequeathed, are not mentioned in the Deed, Will, or other Instrument to be registered as aforesaid by any local descriptions or limitations, or are men-

tioned therein by such comprehensive local descriptions as do or may extend to more Counties than , it shall not be necessary to register any such Deed, Will, or other Instrument, or any notice thereof, except in the County within which the Testator resided at his death, or in which the Donor in any such Deed or other Instrument is therein described to have resided at the time of its execution.

4. Provided also, that where any Deed, Will, or other instrument relating to any Charity or Charitable Donation cannot be found or discovered, then an attested or office Copy, or in default thereof such best authenticated Extract or Minute of such Deed, Will, or Instrument, or the part thereof directly or expressly relating to such Charity or Charitable Donation, as such Trustees or Trustee shall be able to obtain, and if none such can be obtained, then a statement of the nature, amount, investment, and general objects of such Charity or Charitable Donation shall be registered in lieu of such original Deed, Will, or Instrument as aforesaid.

5. That where any Trustee, Executor, or Administrator of any Deed, Will, or other Instrument, whereby any Charity or Charitable Donation for the benefit of poor persons in any place in *England* or *Wales*, hath, before

Penalty on
not registering.

the passing of this Act, been founded, established, made, benefited or increased, shall, after the expiration of calendar months from the passing of this act, in any manner act as the Trustee, Executor, or Administrator of, or under such Deed, Will, or other Instrument, and such Deed, Will, or other Instrument shall not have been registered, or notice of the registry thereof shall not have been given when necessary, according to the direction of this Act, every such Trustee, Executor, or Administrator so acting shall forfeit the sum of

 ; and that where any Trustee, Executor, or Administrator of any Deed, Will, or other Instrument whereby any Charity or Charitable Donation for the benefit of poor persons in any place in *England* or *Wales* shall, after the passing of this Act, be founded, established, made, benefited or increased, shall after the expiration of calendar months from the execution of such Deed or other Instrument, not being of a testamentary nature, by the grantor or grantors in such Deed or Instrument, or shall after the expiration of calendar months from the death of the party making such will or other Instrument of a testamentary nature, in any manner act as the Trustee, Executor, or Administrator of such Deed, Will, or other Instrument, and such Deed, Will, or other instrument shall not have been registered, or notice of the Registry thereof shall not have been given when

necessary, according to the direction of this Act, every such Trustee, Executor, or Administrator so acting shall forfeit the sum of

; provided that no information, action, or suit shall be brought against any Trustee, Executor, or Administrator, for the recovery of any Penalty hereby imposed upon him or them, after the Deed, Will, or other Instrument shall have been registered, or notice of the registering thereof, when necessary, shall have been given, in respect of which such penalty shall or would have been incurred.

6. That every such Clerk of the Peace, or his Deputy or Chief Clerk, before he enters upon the execution of the office hereby imposed upon him, shall be sworn before one of His Majesty's Justices of the Peace (who are hereby empowered and required respectively to administer such oath) in these words:—

“ You shall swear, That you will truly
 “ and faithfully perform and execute Oath of the Clerk of the Peace
 “ the office and duty that is directed
 “ and required by you to be done by
 “ an Act of Parliament, passed in the
 “ fiftieth year of the reing of King
 “ GEORGE the third, intituled, *An*
 “ *Act for the registering and secur-*
 “ *ing of Charitable Donations for the*
 “ *Benefit of Poor Persons in Eng-*
 “ *land.*

“ So help you God.”

Attendance
of the Clerk
of the Peace

7. That every such Clerk of the Peace or his Deputy or Chief Clerk shall give due attendance at the Office to which he belongs, for the dispatch of all business belonging to the said Office and created by this Act; and that every such Clerk of the Peace or his Deputy or Chief Clerk, as often as required, shall make searches concerning all Registries and Entries that are registered as aforesaid, and give Copies of the same under his hand, if required by any Person, testified by one credible Witness.

Allowance
to the Clerk
of the Peace.

8. That every such Clerk of the Peace shall be allowed for the making of every such Registry and Entry as is by this Act directed, the sum of and no more, in case the same do not exceed four hundred words, but if such Registry or Entry shall exceed four hundred words, then after the rate and proportion of an hundred for all the words contained in such Entry, and the like Fees for the like number of words contained in every Copy of any Entry given out of the said Register, and no more; and for every search in the said Registry, the sum of

Penalty on
Neglect, &c.
of the Clerk
of the Peace.

9. That if any Clerk of the Peace or his Deputy or Chief Clerk shall be lawfully convicted of any neglect or misdemeanor in the execution of the duty hereby imposed upon

him, he shall forfeit for every such Offence the sum of _____ ; but no Information, Action, or Suit shall be brought against any Clerk of the Peace, or his Deputy or Chief Clerk, for any forfeiture to be incurred by him after the expiration of _____ years from the time of the neglect or misdemeanor in respect of which the forfeiture has been incurred.

10. That if any Person or Persons shall at any time wilfully make or cause or procure to be made in any Register Book hereinbefore-mentioned, any false Registry of any Deed, Will, or other Instrument hereby directed to be registered as aforesaid, or wilfully give any false notice to any Clerk of the Peace of any Registry, and be thereof lawfully convicted, such Person or Persons shall be fined and imprisoned in such manner as the Court, before whom such Person or Persons shall be convicted, shall in its discretion think fit and direct.

11. That where any part of the Funds given or to be given for the support of or towards any such Charity as aforesaid shall be lent out on real personal or other security, or be or remain in the hands of any Person or Persons, such money shall be called in as soon as conveniently may be, and the same together with all monies in hand (other than and except as to monies immediately applica-

Punishment
of false Re-
gistry.

Personal
Funds of
Charities to
be vested in
the Trustees.

ble to the annual or incidental expences of such Charity or Charities respectively) shall be invested in the purchase of Three per Cent. Consolidated Bank Annuities, or of Three per Cent. reduced Annuities, in the name or names of the Trustee or Trustees of such Charity or Charities respectively, or of some or more of them; provided, that nothing herein-contained shall be construed to extend to require any investment where the Funds of any Charity or Charitable Endowment shall not in the whole amount to more than nor to compel any Trustee or Trustees to call in and invest any money which the Testator or Donor shall himself in his life-time have laid out or invested in any permanent Security, and which he or she shall not have directed to be called in.

Respon-
sibility of
Trustees.

12. Provided always, that where any Trustee of any Charity or Charitable Endowment shall refuse or wilfully omit to call in and invest, or to join in calling in and investing any such Funds as are hereby directed to be called in and invested, every such Trustee shall be and become responsible for any deficiency or defect of Securities in which such Funds shall remain or be lent, and shall be liable and compellable to make good any loss thereby occasioned, by and out of his or her own proper Estate and Effects.

13. That the sums of Money hereby directed to be forfeited by any Clerk of the Peace or his Deputy, Chief Clerk, Trustee, Executor or Administrator, shall be recovered, with full Costs of Suit, by any person who shall inform or sue for the same, and shall and may be sued for by Action of Debt, Bill, Complaint or Information in any of His Majesty's Courts of Record at Westminster, wherein no Essoign, Protection, Privilege, or Wager of Law shall be allowed, nor any more than one Imparlance. Recovery of Penalties.

14. That nothing in this Act shall be construed to extend to any Hospital, School, or other Charitable Institution whatsoever, which shall have been founded, improved, or regulated by or under the Authority of any Special Act of Parliament thereunto particularly relating; nor to any Friendly Society the Rules whereof shall have been confirmed according to the provisions of the Act or Acts for the Encouragement and Relief of Friendly Societies; nor to any Charitable Donation which has been or shall be directed to be wholly applied or expended within any space of time not exceeding years. Not to extend to certain Cases.

Saving always to the King's Most Excellent MAJESTY, and to all other persons, such power of superintending and regulating Charities and Charitable Establishments, and the Saving Clause.

Property and Funds thereof, as they respectively had before the making of this Act.

SCHEDULES

TO WHICH THIS ACT REFERS.

Schedule (A.)

A REGISTER, in pursuance of an Act for the registering and securing of Charitable Donations for the Benefit of Poor Persons in *England*, of an Indenture dated the day of in the Year of our Lord made between of the first part [*name the Parties to the Deed*] whereby it was declared, That the Sum of Three per Cent. Consolidated Annuities, [*or other Property*] transferred, &c. into the Names of the said was so transferred, &c. upon the Trusts, &c. [*state the Trusts of the Transfer, or of the Charitable Donation or Conveyance, in the Words of the Deed, and the Property or Securities in which the Funds of the Charity or*

Charitable Donations are invested, or of which they consist at the Time of the Registry.

Schedule (B.)

A REGISTER, in pursuance of an Act for the registering and securing of Charitable Donations for the Benefit of Poor Persons in *England*, of the Probate of the last Will and Testament of _____ late of _____ in the Parish of _____ in the County of _____ bearing Date the _____ Day of _____ in the Year of our Lord _____ and proved the _____ Day of _____ in the Year _____ in the _____ Court of _____ whereby the said _____ (amongst other Things) did give and devise unto, &c. [*state the Charitable Bequest or Donation in the Words of the Will, and the Property or Securities in which the Funds of the Charity or Charitable Donation are invested, or of which they consist at the Time of the Registry.*]

BRIEF OBSERVATIONS.

BRIEF OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

PRESENT ENQUIRY

INTO THE CONDUCT OF

HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS

THE DUKE OF YORK;

WRITTEN IN THE INTERVAL BETWEEN THE DEBATE

ON FRIDAY AND THAT ON MONDAY.

By J. MASON, Esq.

LONDON;

PRINTED BY J. M'CORMERY, FLEET-STREET.

1809.

HIS Majesty, at the Levee on Wednesday, took occasion, in a very audible voice, to express to the Earl of Chatham, his regret at the public calamity of long harangues, which were now in fashion. He said it was the age of speech-making, and not of discussion.

Morning Chronicle, March 10.

BRIEF · OBSERVATIONS:

THE subject relating to the Duke of York, has been discussed with so much heat and in such long harangues, that it is become involved and obscure. A few observations concerning it may be of use, and as they shall be very brief and temperate, they may be attractive from their novelty.

It appears that the Duke of York has been Commander in Chief fourteen years—that for three years of this time, ending May 1806, he was connected with a woman who sold the influence she professed to have over him to several persons, making of such sale in the whole about 3000*l*.—that in March 1809, this woman is brought to the Bar of the House of Commons to prove his Royal Highness's connivance at that sale.

All attempts that have been made to shew that proper officers have been supplanted or

improper officers promoted, have egregiously failed, and the whole weight of the accusation consists in this, that his Royal Highness connived at his mistress making money of her professed influence over his mind.

This connivance is asserted by the dismissed mistress, and corroborated by the numbers she applied for, compared with her original rank in life; it is contradicted by her express wishes that the disgraceful transactions alluded to might be kept secret from the Duke; by his Royal Highness's indifference and insensibility to her threats of vengeance, by the respectability of his confidential servants, by the appearance of official documents, by the smallness of the sums received, and by the nature of the testimony.

The connivance is believed by one party and totally disbelieved by another. In my opinion there is a middle supposition nearer the truth than that maintained by either. Every man has felt, whether in examining his own conduct or that of his intimate friends, how easily he deceives himself into the neglect of minute circumstances, which if laboriously sifted would call down our unmixed censure. When mentioned they awaken our indignation and surprise, but if not mentioned under the cover of a delusion, which we all practise on ourselves more or less, they quite escape our notice. If

this delusion relates only to ourselves, we condemn it, if to those we love, we frequently applaud it. The Duke of York appears to me to have exhibited a levity of this nature as to Mrs. Clarke, whose passion for expense in every way seems to have been unbounded. I take the middle line between his accusers and his defenders, as the only line marked out by the evidence.

Now the question is, whether the levity described merits a heavier punishment than that the Duke of York has already suffered, in the disclosure of those transactions, which every man is most anxious to keep hidden from the world—whether for such an offence to exclude him from the only active and honorable employment he can engage in; to shut him out from the public service, is not a hard and cruel measure,

In a moral view, as far as that levity is concerned by which a most disgraceful traffic was concealed, the claims of justice must be regarded as fully satisfied. His Royal Highness has paid a severe penalty for a fault, which I will venture to say, might be found in a truly honorable and noble mind. All that remains therefore is, to inquire into the political consequences attending the heavier punishment of dismissal. There is a boistrous over-acted morality, which

is as pernicious to a state as corruption itself. It is big in pretension, exacting in performances, vindictive in punishment, cold in heart, disgusting in manner, it feels nothing, and for that reason hazards nothing. To the milder inquirer the question will occur what will be the consequences of the dismissal of the present Commander in Chief? Whether our situation as far as his duties go, will be improved by such an event. Who will succeed him? Probably one of his younger brothers—unacquainted with business, undisciplined by habits of application, unrebuked for levities. Will this be an improvement? But a completely new arrangement may be made for the office of Commander in Chief. The chances are very much against effecting such a scheme. But grant you succeed.—In that case the Duke of York may be suffered to continue in his office till the new arrangement is completed, for moral justice is, as I have said, already satisfied, and as to the public, it must be a most serious inconvenience to have two changes in so short an interval in so important an office, particularly when the first change will probably be for the worse. If the Duke stands in the way of a necessary reform, aim at his dismissal for this reason, but never let us fix a stigma upon him by a side-blow.

Thus far for the question concerning the connivance at corruption, the question as it exists

between Mr. Wardle and Mr. Perceval. A third mode of concluding the discussion has been suggested—namely—to negative the idea of criminal participation or corruption, but still under all the circumstances to object to his Royal Highness continuing in the situation of Commander in Chief.

Now if we acquit the Duke of all criminality as to corruption, and if we think he has suffered sufficiently for his levity, the only remaining offence, for which he is to lose his office, must consist in his profligate connexions with women. The whole subject here assumes a totally new shape, and a shape of a nature not a little extraordinary. For though this offence has been committed by many of the most eminent men in all ages and countries, I have never heard or read of it being brought against them as incapacitating them for great public employments. Mr. Whitbread, in his speech during Thursday's debate, alluding to a certain note, is reported to have made use of the phrase "as dead as Homer." My admiration of the honorable and powerful activity of that speaker, does not induce me to allow such a phrase to be used in such a manner, but assuredly, if the shade of the mighty-dead had heard in it's wrath so light a mention, the father of poetry would have laughed to scorn those arguments, which would have gone to cashier his Achilles or his

Agamemnon from their respective commands, because each of them kept mistresses. Clytemnestra played her own game, and a sanguinary game it was, but the king of men was nevertheless a great commander.

But let the question be fairly put. Are the public, is the House of Commons as representing that public, prepared to decree that no man keeping a mistress shall hold an important office. Farewell then for ever ye Henrys of France, farewell ye Foxes of England. Do we imagine that by parliamentary decrees we shall make men perfect? Do we imagine we shall be liberated from the necessity of choosing between frailties? Do we look forward beyond the option, whether in public men we will have those faults, which go to make men mild and amiable, or those, which are usually connected with harshness and severity. Let every fault and crime receive it's due punishment. Experience shews that the sort of profligacy here alluded to is pursued by not the most merciful of the juries, but the public are not necessarily injured by it, nor should the representatives of that public ever decree against it, unless they can prove at the same time some decisive act of political wrong. Where is it found that the House of Commons are guardians of the public morality? They are legislators, but, (I speak with becoming deference) not censors.

I would not plead for the immoralities of any man, but if to the injury necessarily accruing from such immoralities to his domestic happiness, we add the disclosure of his most unguarded moments before a scrutinizing and not a favorable public, those of the Duke of York appear sufficiently expiated. To deprive him of his office for such a reason, seems to me to inflict a most heavy punishment for an offence of which the public have no right on earth to take cognizance. Prove, that through Mrs. Clarke improper appointments have been made, or proper appointments prevented, and a public ground is laid for a public proceeding. But surely those, who, having no such ground, still deliberately pursue his Royal Highness in order to fix upon him a signal stigma, must have uncommonly pure or uncommonly hardened consciences. There is something unsound in this, and those who confound moral distinctions, we may be assured, are not the real, though they may be the honest friends of virtue.

There appears to have been some confusion in regarding the evidence against the Duke of York, in the same light as evidence against prisoners in a court of justice. We may observe however this difference, that in the latter we investigate a known crime, in the former the crime and the criminal are alike to be discovered. When a crime is known to have been com-

mitted, when, as in case of murder for instance, we are certain that a fellow creature has met with a violent death, we are bound to take all the evidence we can, as soon as we can, to attach the crime to some person. But in such an affair as the Duke of York's, our investigation is purely voluntary—the first supposition is that there is no such crime—we should reject all evidence that is not correct and properly fortified in both cases, but surely when there is every reason to doubt both of the fault and the offender, when there is time for a pause, when no example of known and unpunished delinquency exposes us to danger, we should be careful indeed that we ground not our accusation on evidence which would not lead to conviction where the offence at least was acknowledged. If such an accusation merely went to the expression of a censorial opinion, any incorrectness, or rashness, in the proceeding, would be less culpable, but when it is attended with a judicial act, with the penalty of the loss of office and employment, with a most heavy fine, we must have proof, and legal proof, not surmise. This observation may be illustrated without leaving our subject. The most signal disgrace which ever stained our military reputation befel us the year before last, in South America. Our troops, whom we know to be as gallant as any in the world, were beat to a surrender by the undisciplined rabble of an unfortified town.

This event, which was known all over the earth, which went directly to diminish our security in the great contest in which we are engaged, was solely attributed to the commander, General Whitelocke. Now is it not most extraordinary that no solemn enquiry was made into the appointment of such a man. When an officer is guilty of cowardice, the appointer is not blameable, because he is bound to conclude, that no officer is a coward. But for a very grievous error in judgment, the appointer does appear responsible. It is his peculiar business to take care that the expedition intended is not entrusted to dulness and ignorance. The appointee in this case will not object, because it generally, happens that presumption and incapacity bear a very exact proportion to each other. Here then was an offence ready to our hands—an offence of magnitude enough to resound through the globe—and yet, strange to say, not a word, as far as I recollect, was said in the House of Commons concerning its origin; in that house, which have employed 36 hours without coming to a conclusion, in discussing 500 pages of evidence on a charge, in proving which the testimony of an enraged cast-off mistress is chiefly worth notice. Mr. Perceval says he would not whip a dog on such testimony. Certainly, as far as the charge of conniving at corruption is concerned, I believe no grand jury in England would find a bill on such

testimony. Is there not then something strange in this conduct, which on vague and dubious evidence accuses the Duke of York of an improbable offence, while a real and glaring fault, connected with his office, and that of the most momentous nature passes, without investigation.

It is the more necessary to observe this contrast, because by a perpetual anxiety for small objects, we are in imminent danger of rendering ourselves unequal to that incalculably great cause which we are left alone in the world to support and restore. England is at this moment, if we except the infant America, the sole depositary of the collected wisdom of all past times, and furnishes the great hope of the recovery of the world from a state of degradation lower than that of the middle ages. While we guard *public* virtue at home, let us never lose sight of this our great vocation. The various inquiries already instituted have proved that corruption has prevailed to a far less extent than could have been imagined. Let us proceed with regularity and with less anxiety. A man walking in London acknowledges the necessity there is for sweeping the streets and carrying away the dirt, but nevertheless he removes his eyes from the besom and the dust cart to fix them upon magnificent buildings, to look about for his friends, and to take care he is not knocked down.

Should not this be our example in our political career? We want dilating as much as purifying—size as much as amendment. There seems to have been an extraordinary degree of unnecessary bluster in this affair of the Duke of York. His letter was too blustering, his accusers too blustering, his defenders too blustering. In his conduct with regard to the army there is much to applaud, something to censure, and something to pardon. A due allowance for each others frailties will make us more anxious to prove than to punish, and bring us back to our accustomed good nature. The close of the last session of parliament, when the Spanish insurrection first broke out, that was the season for bluster. Mr. Sheridan shed upon us a faint and solitary beam, which was scarcely felt, and expired. How have we encouraged the people of Spain? This is the question for eloquence. Alas! we sent divided battalions, only to shew the difficulties of their junction, and our senators, eloquent as they now appear, were torpid, dumb, or objecting. The regular armies of Europe had been destroyed one after another, and we had no hope in tactics, but Spain opened before us a new scene. That scene was welcomed by England with one unanimous burst of rapture and applause. How was the spirit of the people represented by ministers? They sent scattered troops, to shew the miseries, not the pomp of war; to suffer themselves, not

rouse others, to erect the signal of distress, not of levy; and what is the issue? a miserable squabble about dates.

It has been said, that if the accusation against the Duke of York had been brought against a man of inferior rank, in the same manner, such a man would have sunk under it. Then would not such a man have been most hardly used? Let us state the case on these grounds. A man is appointed to the command of the army—an office in which he has every day and every hour to select from a number of applicants of equal pretensions, one, two, or three, for certain commissions—he has been in this office fourteen years—during this time many most wise regulations are acknowledged to have been made and acted upon for the promotion of officers, and the soldiery have improved extremely in comfort, discipline, and efficiency—the first eight years of his holding this office are in no respect assailed—at the end of this time he forms an unfortunate connexion with a fascinating woman; who seduces him into an entire devotion and self-abandonment, and obtains such power over him as to influence his mind in military appointments—in this state of surrender and dereliction he does not enquire into the motives which may induce this woman so to interest herself—the connexion lasts three years, at which time, on the discovery of certain irregularities, he has

firmness sufficient to effect a complete separation—the remaining three years of his command are as entirely unimpeached as the eight first—these three years having elapsed, it appears, that the motives which induced our heroine to interest herself for the persons soliciting her good will, were pecuniary—such are the circumstances on which I have asked myself the question, whether I would wish this man to be removed from his command with disgrace? and I have answered decidedly—no—If an inquiry into the conduct of this supposed person had taken place during the lady's reign, it would have been necessary to have insisted either upon the loss of office or her dismissal, but when the lover has been in possession of his senses for three years, to pursue him with infamy and deprivations, would appear to me, if I had not a high respect for some severe judges, an act of unexampled rigour, not to say, injustice.

To return to the Duke of York. It has been said that he may possibly be at some future period our sovereign. The event is highly improbable, even allowing that Mr. York relinquishes all idea of an exclusion bill. However, the inquiry at the bar of the House of Commons has disclosed nothing to make us regret its possibility. Comparing all the circumstances of the case with the nature of the office, I should pronounce the result of the inquiry to be—that

the Duke of York is not a corrupt man, that he is a man of business, that he has a regard for public opinion, that he is no tyrant.

The national severity on this point is not very explicable, nor can I admire a clamorous judge. It may perhaps be ascribed in part to the same cause which betrayed the duke—the charms of the lady. The nation, (I except of course my lords, the judges, and the right reverend the bishops, and the society for the suppression of vice) do certainly appear to be in love with Mrs. Clarke. No man can mistake the lover's anger at the Chancellor of the Exchequer, but the newspaper must be wrong in that part of the speech which relates to the adultery bill. I will except also Mr. Whitbread, and the author of this publication. They would not talk so contemptuously of these “Dalilahs,” if their own hearts were touched. “Let the galled jade go wince, our withers are unwrung.” Would we could send the dame to interpose her all conquering powers between Bonaparte and the devoted house of Austria. We should then turn them to good account. But the final battle will probably be fought, while we ourselves are in her fetters.

In reading the report of the debates on the subject of these pages, I have been wishing for

three resolutions or declarations of the following nature, which indeed may be yet to come.

I. That all attempts to prove his Royal Highness the Duke of York guilty of corruption, or conniving at corruption, have totally failed.

II. That many infamous practices have existed with regard to commissions in the army, which his Royal Highness ought to have suspected, pursued, and checked, and that this House have to regret and censure that want of vigilance and circumspection, which for three of the fourteen years he has commanded the army, he has failed to manifest.

III. That the House of Commons do acknowledge with singular pleasure the high state of improvement and perfection, to which the army has been brought during his Royal Highness's command.

THE END.

LETTER

TO

THE EARL CAMDEN;

BY THE

RIGHT HON. GEO. CANNING, &c. &c.

LETTER
TO
THE EARL CAMDEN;
CONTAINING
A FULL, CORRECT, AND AUTHENTIC
Narrative
OF THE
TRANSACTIONS CONNECTED WITH THE
LATE DUEL.

BY THE
RIGHT HON. GEORGE CANNING.

FROM THE PILOT.

Audi alteram partem.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR JAMES RIDGWAY, 170, PICCADILLY
OPPOSITE BOND-STREET.

1809.

W. Flint, Printer, Old Bailey,
London.

ADVERTISEMENT.

By the kindness of a friend in the high political circles, we have this day the satisfaction to present to our readers, at full length, Mr. Canning's statement of the transactions which impelled Lord Castlereagh to seek the late hostile meeting. It is addressed to the Earl Camden, and intended as an answer to the statement published in the newspapers by the authority of that Noble Earl, as well as to those other statements which, though anonymous, are generally understood to have proceeded from very near connections of Lord Castle-

reagh, and, indeed, have been charged upon one of those intimate connections, and not disclaimed. We understand, that Mr. Canning, as soon as his health permitted, began to prepare the materials of his vindication; and that the statement which we present this day was, in fact, made up several weeks ago; but being intended to be first submitted to the Duke of Portland, whose authority was personally referred to on many points, it was withheld for some days in consequence of the very bad state of health of that Noble Duke, which rendered it impossible to make any reference to his Grace on matters of business. It is known that the operation which was expected to have restored his Grace to comparative health and ease, unhappily terminated his life; and upon this event, Mr. Canning, far from advancing, as

some of his opponents very indecently anticipated, more numerous and more bold assertions, on the sanction of an authority beyond the grave, revised his statement, and carefully expunged every thing that rested on the personal corroboration of the Noble Duke, retaining, as he says, only such facts as were known to most of his Colleagues, and particularly to the Noble Earl whom he addresses ; and referring only to documents which are extant, and may be easily traced. The statement, after undergoing these alterations, was again complete, and ready to be transmitted to the Earl Camden, in a few days after the Duke of Portland's funeral, but again experienced a delay in consequence of a severe indisposition of the Noble Earl. It was withheld till his Lordship's recovery, which was announced, by his Lordship's issuing on Friday last, his

cards of thanks for the inquiries made during his confinement.

It will appear from this detail, that Mr. Canning, in doing justice to his own feelings, paid particular attention to what was due to every other person ; and on the perusal of the book, and the consideration of all the circumstances connected with it, we are satisfied it will appear that Mr. Canning has done, what in every former view of the case, was thought impracticable—he has righted himself without doing wrong to any man.

Pilot-Office, 104, Strand,

27th Nov. 1809.

LETTERS,

&c.

To the Earl CAMDEN, &c. &c.

Gloucester Lodge, Nov. 14, 1809.

MY LORD;

I HAD written to your Lordship, immediately after the publication of your Lordship's statement, but I delayed sending my letter, in the hope of being able previously to submit it to the perusal of the Duke of Portland.

In this hope I have been disappointed by that fatal event, which has deprived this country of one of its most upright and disinterested patriots: the King, of one of his most

faithful, devoted and affectionate subjects ; and the world one of the most blameless and most noble-minded of men.

Thus situated, I have thought it right to revise what I had written, and scrupulously to expunge every reference to the authority of the Duke of Portland, which would now stand upon my sole testimony ; retaining such only as are supported, either by written documents which I shall be happy to communicate to your Lordship ; or by facts which are well known to your Lordship or to your Colleagues, and in which for the most part, your Lordship is yourself concerned,

Neither, however, can I content myself with this precaution ; but must protest, at the same time, in the most earnest manner, against any possible misconstruction, by which any thing in the following letter, can be strained to a meaning, unfavourable to the motives which actuated the Duke of Portland's conduct.

It is impossible, indeed, not to regret the policy, however well intentioned, which dic-

tated the reserve practised towards Lord Castlereagh in the beginning of this transaction ; or that practised towards myself in its conclusion.

It is to be regretted, that the Duke of Portland should have imposed, and that your Lordship should have accepted the condition of silence, in the first communications between you.

It is also to be regretted, that I should not have learnt in July, that your Lordship was not party to the assurances then given to me on behalf of Lord Castlereagh's friends in general and that another Member of the Cabinet, comprehended in that description, had, (as I have since heard), refused to concur in them.

Had I been made acquainted with these circumstances, I should then have resigned ; and my resignation would, at that time, have taken place without inconvenience or embarrassment ; and without stirring those questions (no way connected with the causes of my retirement) or subjecting me to those misinterpretations of my conduct and motives, which have been pro-

duced by the coincidence of my resignation with that of the Duke of Portland.

But, however this reserve may be to be regretted, it is impossible to attribute the adoption of it, on the part of the Duke of Portland, to any other motives, than to that gentleness of nature which eminently distinguished him : and which led him to endeavour (above all things) to prevent political differences from growing into personal dissensions ; and to aim at executing whatever arrangement might be expedient for improving or strengthening the Administration, with the concurrence (if possible) of all its existing Members.

And no man who knows the affectionate respect and attachment, which the manly and generous qualities of the Duke of Portland's mind were calculated to command, and which I invariably bore to him, will suspect me of being willing to establish my own vindication, at the expence of the slightest disrespect to his memory, or prejudice to his fame.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord, your Lordship's

Most obedient humble servant,

GEORGE CANNING

To the Earl CAMDEN, &c. &c.

MY LORD,

THE statement, which has been published in the newspapers, in your Lordship's name, has decided a question on which I had before been hesitating, as to the necessity of an authentic detail of the transactions (so far as I am concerned in them or am acquainted with them) to which that statement refers.

For that purpose, I think a direct address to your Lordship more decorous, both towards your Lordship and for myself, than an anonymous paragraph in a newspaper.

It is with the most painful reluctance, that I recur to a subject, which, so far as it concerns Lord Castlereagh and myself, had been settled in a manner, which is usually, I believe, considered as final.

Discussions of the causes of dispute more commonly precede^{ed} than follow the extreme appeal to which Lord Castlereagh resorted : and when, after mature consideration, his lordship had determined to resort to that appeal in the first instance, I should have thought, that such a choice, deliberately made, would have been felt by his friends to be equally conclusive upon them, as upon himself.

But your Lordship needs not to be informed how assiduously my character has been assailed by writers in the newspapers, espousing Lord Castlereagh's quarrel, and supposed (I trust, most injuriously) to be his Lordship's particular friends.

The perversions and misrepresentations of anonymous writers, however, would not have extorted from me any reply. But to them succeeded the publication of Lord Castlereagh's letter to me of the 19th of September.

I entirely disbelieve that Lord Castlereagh, and I distinctly deny that I myself, had any knowledge of this publication.

But, by what means it matters not, the Letter is before the world : and though the course originally chosen by Lord Castlereagh precluded me from offering any explanation to him ;—the course which has since been adopted on his behalf (though undoubtedly without his privity), might perhaps have been considered as rendering such an explanation due to myself. It is, however, only since your Lordship's publication that I have felt it to be indispensably necessary.

The statement on my behalf, which has also found its way (without my consent and against my wish) into the public papers, was written under a sense of delicacy and restraint as to the particulars of the transaction, which, from the character of the transaction itself, must always continue to prevail in a great degree ; but from which, until Wednesday, the 11th of October, the day on which I gave up the Seals, I had not an opportunity of soliciting any dispensation.

Of the indulgence which I then most humbly solicited, I trust I shall be able to avail my-

self sufficiently for my own vindication, without losing sight of those considerations of duty and propriety, by which the use of such an indulgence must necessarily be regulated and confined.

It is stated in Lord Castlereagh's Letter, "That I had demanded and procured from the Duke of Portland, before the rising of Parliament, a promise for Lord Castlereagh's removal from the War Department; that, by this promise, Lord Castlereagh's situation, as a Minister of the Crown, was made dependant upon my pleasure; and that this promise I afterwards thought myself entitled to enforce;"

"That, after and notwithstanding this virtual supercession of Lord Castlereagh in his office, I allowed him to originate and conduct the Expedition to the Scheldt;"

"And that, during this whole period, I knew that the agitation, and the decision, of the question for his removal, were concealed

from him ; and was party to this concealment."

Lord Castlereagh indeed admits,

That he " has no right, as a public man, to resent my demanding upon public grounds, his removal from his office, or even from the Administration, as a condition of my continuing a Member of the Government."

But he contends, that a proposition "justifiable in itself," ought not to have been "executed in an unjustifiable manner:" and he makes me responsible for the manner in which the "Head of the Administration," and some members of the Government, "*supposed* to be his (Lord Castlereagh's) friends," executed the proposition, which he attributes to me.

He is ready to acknowledge, indeed, "that I pressed for a disclosure, at the same time that I pressed for a decision ; and that the disclosure was resisted by the Duke of Portland and his (Lord Castlereagh's) *supposed* friends."

But in this circumstance Lord Castlereagh professes not to see any justification of what he conceives to have been my conduct towards him ;—because, by acquiescing in the advice or intreaties of his “ supposed friends,” I admitted “ an authority” on their part, “ which I must have known them not to possess ;—because, by pressing for disclosure,” I shewed my own sense of the “ unfairness” of concealment ;—and because with that sense, I “ ought,” as he conceives me not to have done), “ to have availed myself of the same alternative,—namely, my own resignation,—to enforce disclosure, which I did to enforce decision.”

Without offering a single word in the way of argument, I shall, by a distinct detail of facts in the order of their date, substantiate my contradiction of these charges.

I shall only premise,

1st—That I had (as is admitted by Lord Castlereagh) an unquestionable right to require on public grounds, a change in the War

Department, tendering, at the same time, the alternative of my own resignation.

2dly.—(What no man at all acquainted with the course of public business will dispute), that the regular, effectual, and straight-forward course for bringing that alternative to issue, was to state it directly to the “Head of the Administration,”—the King’s Chief Minister,—to be laid by that Minister before the King.

I proceed to a detail of facts :

April 2nd.—In the beginning of April, I addressed a letter to the Duke of Portland, containing a representation on the State of his Administration ; and expressing my wish and intention, unless some change were effected in it, to resign.

April 4th to 8th.—Upon the Duke of Portland’s requiring a more detailed explanation, as to the motives of my proffered resignation, I stated, among other things, that a change either in my own Department or in Lord

Castlereagh's, appeared to me to be expedient for the public service. I stated my perfect willingness that the alternative should be decided for my retirement; and only requested that the decision might (if possible) take place before the re-commencement of business in Parliament after the Easter holidays.

The Duke of Portland requested me to suspend the execution of my intention to resign; wishing to have an opportunity of consulting with some of our Colleagues, before he determined what advice to lay before the King.

April 16th.—The Easter holidays thus passed away. On the 16th of April, shortly after his Grace's return to town from Bulstrode, the Duke of Portland opened the subject to one of the Members of the Cabinet, whose name (not having been hitherto brought forward), I do not think it necessary to mention. Your Lordship is perfectly acquainted with it.

By the Duke of Portland's desire, I had a

communication with that Member of the Cabinet, within a very few days after his interview with the Duke of Portland. He strongly represented the difficulty of making any new arrangement, during the sitting of Parliament, and urged me to defer the pressing my own resignation till the end of the Session.—To this recommendation I did not promise to accede; but we agreed (whether upon his suggestion or upon mine I am not confident), that, at all events, no step whatever could properly be taken, until after the decision of the question upon the Writership;—which was about this time brought forward in the House of Commons.

April 25th.—That question was decided on Tuesday the 25th of April.

April 28th.—On Friday the 28th, the Duke of Portland communicated fully with your Lordship; and informed me, as the result of that communication, that your Lordship thought a change in Lord Castlereagh's situation in the Government desirable,—provided it could be effected honourably for Lord Castle-

reagh, and that it "could be reconciled to Lord Castlereagh's feelings."

From this period, I understood that your Lordship was constantly consulted by the Duke of Portland in every step of the transaction. Other Members of the Cabinet were also consulted by the Duke of Portland: but how many of them, or at what precise periods, I neither knew at the time, nor can now undertake to say.

Shortly after your Lordship's first interview with the Duke of Portland (I am sure before the 5th of May) that Member of the Cabinet with whom his Grace had first communicated, reported to me a suggestion of your Lordship's of a change of office for Lord Castlereagh, evidently calculated on the principles which your Lordship had stated as indispensable to such a change.—Whether this communication to me was in the name of a direct message from your Lordship, I do not exactly know. But I understood distinctly that you knew of its being made to me;—and that whatever observation I might make upon it, was to be re-

ported to your Lordship. What I observed upon it was in substance, that it was not for me to presume to say what change would be proper; that I had done all that I had thought myself either called upon or at liberty to do, in stating to the Duke of Portland my opinions, and my intentions to resign; that the Duke of Portland alone could either propose any change or obtain the necessary authority for carrying it into effect; and that I therefore recommended that your Lordship should state your suggestion to the Duke of Portland.

May 5th.—On the 5th of May the Duke of Portland informed me that he had determined to lay the whole subject, on the following Wednesday, before his Majesty.

May 10th.—On Wednesday the 10th of May, he informed me that he had done so; and that His Majesty had been graciously pleased to say, that he would take the subject into his serious consideration.

May 31st.—On Wednesday, the 31st of May, apprehending it to be possible, that my

intention might not have been fully explained to His Majesty, and thinking it my duty to leave no doubt upon it, I humbly repeated to His Majesty the representations which I had before made to the Duke of Portland, and humbly tendered my resignation. I received thereupon His Majesty's gracious commands to retain my situation until His Majesty should have considered the whole subject.

June 8th.—Some time in the course of the next week, I think on the 8th of June, the Duke of Portland stated to me, that he had received His Majesty's commands to propose, and to carry into effect, at the end of the Session of Parliament, an arrangement for a partial change in the War Department.

The particulars of this arrangement I do not think it proper to detail; feeling it my duty to limit myself strictly to what is absolutely necessary for the explanation of my own conduct. It is sufficient to state, that the object of this arrangement, was not the removal of Lord Castlereagh, but a new distribution of the business of the War Department, whereby

that part of it which was connected with political correspondence, would have been transferred to the Foreign Office; and the business of another office, then vacant, would have been transferred to Lord Castlereagh. It is only necessary to add, that the effect of this new distribution would not have been to take out of Lord Castlereagh's hands the superintendence of the Expedition to the Scheldt.

June 13th.—On the 13th of June, I wrote to the Duke of Portland, signifying to him that, although such an arrangement had never entered into my contemplation, and although I did not think it calculated to remedy all the difficulties which had induced me to bring the state of the Administration under his Grace's consideration, I was ready, so far as I was concerned, to undertake and discharge to the best of my ability, any duty which His Majesty might be graciously pleased to devolve upon me; but I expressed at the same time great doubts, whether this arrangement could be expected to be acceptable to Lord Castlereagh, or, in all its parts, satisfactory to the public feeling.

June 18th.—On Sunday, the 18th of June, (Parliament being expected to rise on the 20th or 21st) I wrote to the Duke of Portland, to enquire whether this arrangement, or any other, was to take place; stating to him, that “if things remained as they then were, I was determined not to remain in office.”

June 18th.—In answer, the Duke of Portland mentioned to me a new plan of arrangement, altogether different from that, which he had been authorised to carry into effect; and stated that he had sent for your Lordship, and the other Member of the Cabinet with whom your Lordship and the Duke of Portland had been in constant communication, to co-operate with him, in forwarding this new plan, and to urge Lord Castlereagh to consent to it.

The particulars of this new plan, I do not think it necessary to state, as I learnt from the Duke of Portland, either the next day, or the day following it, that to this plan Lord Castlereagh certainly could not be brought to agree. Whether this was known to his Grace only from your Lordship, or through your Lordship,

from Lord Castlereagh himself, I was not apprized.

June 21st.—On Wednesday the 21st, the day of the rising of Parliament, I was assured by the Duke of Portland, that the specific arrangement which he had in the first instance proposed, viz. the new distribution of the business of the War Department, should be carried into effect;—and that His Majesty had directed him to desire your Lordship to communicate his decision to Lord Castlereagh.

June 27th.—On Tuesday the 27th, finding that no communication had been yet made to Lord Castlereagh, I wrote to the Duke of Portland, in terms of the strongest remonstrance, both against the concealment and the delay; and intimated my determination to recur to my original intention, and to press the acceptance of my resignation.

June 28th.—Accordingly on the following day, Wednesday the 28th of June, I had an audience of the King, in which I humbly and earnestly repeated to His Majesty, the tender of my resignation.

June 28th.—That same evening the Duke of Portland informed me that he had that day signified to your Lordship the King's desire, that your Lordship should communicate the intended arrangement to Lord Castlereagh; and that the communication was to be made by your Lordship as soon as the expedition had sailed; which it was expected, would be in less than a fortnight from that time.

July 5th.—But before this fortnight elapsed, viz. on Wednesday the 5th of July, the Duke of Portland informed me, that in consideration of the difficulties attending the proposed arrangement, he, and those with whom he had consulted, were of opinion, that another should be substituted for it, which he trusted would also be more agreeable to me. He told me that hopes were entertained that your Lordship would determine to offer your resignation, for the purpose of facilitating a general arrangement, in which a complete change in the War Department might be effected consistently with Lord Castlereagh's feelings. He said, however, that your Lordship had not yet finally made up your mind upon the subject :

but that you would probably come to a decision before the following Wednesday.

The Duke of Portland stated his intention, in the event of your Lordship's resignation, to submit to his Majesty, the nomination of Lord Wellesley to the War Department.

It was well known by the Duke of Portland that I had been always anxious for Lord Wellesley's accession to the Cabinet: but this was the first mention to me in the course of the transaction, of his introduction into the War Department. But for a severe indisposition, Lord Wellesley would, before this time, have been on his way to Spain.

July 13th.—On Thursday, the 13th of July, the Duke of Portland informed me, that your Lordship had, the day before, actually tendered your resignation; but that your Lordship had annexed to it the conditions, that no change should take place till after the termination of the Expedition to the Scheldt; and that it should be left to your Lordship to choose the time of making any communication to Lord Castlereagh.

July 13th to 30th.—I made the strongest remonstrances against this new delay, and this indefinite renewal of the concealment from Lord Castlereagh. I said, that after the repeated postponements which had already taken place, and after the reserve which had already been practised towards Lord Castlereagh, I could not rely upon the execution of any arrangement which should not be now completely settled in all its parts. And if this were not to be done, I most earnestly entreated that His Majesty might be advised now to accept my resignation.

The Duke of Portland most anxiously deprecated my resignation, as leading in his apprehension, to the dissolution of the Administration. He declared himself to be authorized to assure me, in the most solemn manner, that the arrangement now in contemplation should positively take place at the termination of the Expedition; that the Seals of the War Department should then be offered to Lord Wellesley,—an office (to be vacated by means of your Lordship's retirement), being at the same time to be offered to Lord Castle-

reagh:—and that in the interval, and without loss of time, Lord Castlereagh's friends should take opportunities of preparing him for the change and reconciling him to it, by representing to him the great advantage to be derived from it, in the acquisition of additional strength to the government.

July 13th to 20th.—Not only the Duke of Portland, but other members of the Cabinet, Lord Castlereagh's friends, some directly, and some through common friends, urged me in the most earnest manner, to acquiesce in the postponement now proposed. It was represented to me, that if, instead of pressing for the execution of the arrangement now, time were allowed to Lord Castlereagh's friends to prepare him for the change, and to reconcile him to it, the arrangement might ultimately take place in an amicable manner; that every public object might thus be answered, without any unnecessary harshness to the feelings of individuals: and that so far from finding fresh impediments raised to the execution of the arrangement, when the time arrived, I should find all those, to whose representations I yield-

ed, considering themselves pledged equally with the Duke of Portland, to see it carried into effect.

It is due to your Lordship, to say, that your Lordship's name was not, so far as I recollect, specifically mentioned to me on this occasion ; but it is equally due to myself, to declare that I never for a moment imagined, nor could have believed that the general description of " Lord Castlereagh's friends," as stated to me without exception or qualification by the Duke of Portland, did not comprehend your Lordship, whose proffered resignation was the basis of the whole arrangement, and without whose express consent, therefore, no other person could announce the arrangement to Lord Castlereagh.

July 20th.—By these representations and assurances, at length, most reluctantly, and I confess against my better judgment, I was induced to acquiesce in the proposed postponement of the change ; and consented to remain in office till the termination of the Expedition.

Sept. 2nd.—On Saturday September the 2nd, the result of the Expedition to the Scheldt being then known, I wrote to the Duke of Portland, at Bulstrode, reminding his Grace, that the period fixed for offering the seals of the War Department to Lord Wellesley, was arrived.

Sept. 6th.—On the following Wednesday, the 6th of September, the Duke of Portland informed me, that no steps whatever had been taken by any of Lord Castlereagh's friends to reconcile him to the change, or to prepare for it; that the execution of the arrangement would be attended with other resignations, or at least with one other resignation (of which I had never before received the slightest intimation); and that he had himself determined to retire.

Upon receiving this intelligence, I immediately disclaimed any wish that the arrangement, however positively I understood it to have been settled, should be carried into effect under circumstances to me so unexpected; and instantly reverted to that "alternative" which, upon

each successive stage of difficulties and delays, I had uniformly pressed,—that of the tender of my own resignation;—which I desired the Duke of Portland to lay, that day before the King.

Sept. 7th.—On the following day, Thursday the 7th of September, I declined attending the Cabinet; stating in a letter to the Duke of Portland (which I left to his Grace to communicate to the Cabinet if he should think proper), that I considered my resignation as in His Majesty's hands; and myself as holding my office only until my successor should be named.

Sept. 8th.—On Friday the 8th, I heard from the Duke of Portland that Lord Castlereagh had sent in his resignation. I have been informed since (but whether correctly or not I cannot affirm), that he did so, in consequence of a communication made to him, by your Lordship after the Cabinet of the preceding day.

Sept. 14th.—On Thursday the 14th of Sep-

tember, your Lordship called upon me at the Foreign Office by your own appointment, for the purpose of explaining the causes which had prevented your making any communication to Lord Castlereagh in the earlier stages of this transaction.

Sept. 19th.—On Tuesday September 19th, your Lordship, in answer to a letter of mine of the preceding day, explained to me the grounds of your silence to Lord Castlereagh, during the latter period of the transaction.

Sept. 20.—On Wednesday morning, September the 20th, I received from Lord Castlereagh the letter which produced our meeting.

From the series of facts it appears,

That, in April, I made a representation to the King's First Minister, on the general state of the Administration: and that, in the course of the discussions arising out of that representation, I proposed on public grounds, not as Lord Castlereagh appears to have been informed, his removal from the Administration, but

the alternative of a change, either in the War or Foreign Department ;

That on the 10th of May, the Duke of Portland submitted to His Majesty the subject of my representation ; and informed me that His Majesty would be pleased to take it into his consideration ;

That, from the 10th of May until the 8th of June, I was wholly unapprized of the result of that consideration ; but that, for fear of misapprehension, I had, in person, during that interval, viz. on the 31st of May, humbly repeated my representation, and tendered my resignation to his Majesty ;

That, on or about the 8th of June, for the first time, an arrangement was stated to me, which had for its object a new distribution of the business of the War Department, and that, on the 13th, I signified my acquiescence in that arrangement, so far as I was concerned ;

That, on the 18th, another arrangement was stated to me, as intended to be substituted for

that in which I had acquiesced; but that, on the 21st, it was announced to me that the first arrangement was finally decided upon, was to be immediately carried into effect, and was to be communicated to Lord Castlereagh by your Lordship;

That, on the 27th of June, no step appearing to have been taken, either to execute the intended arrangement, or to apprise Lord Castlereagh of it, I remonstrated against the delay, and against the concealment from Lord Castlereagh; and that, on the 28th, I again tendered my resignation; and that on the same day, your Lordship received an injunction to communicate the intended arrangement to Lord Castlereagh;

That, on the 5th of July, a new plan was stated to me to be in contemplation; a plan originating with your Lordship, and depending, for its execution, upon a step to be taken by yourself; that this plan was, on the 15th, announced to me as settled, and as intended to be substituted for that which had been first proposed;

That I, at that time, renewed my remonstrances in the strongest manner, both against the delay and against the concealment; but that it was stated to me to be an indispensable condition of this plan on your Lordship's part,—that it should not be acted upon till the termination of the Expedition to the Scheldt; and that the time of making the communication to Lord Castlereagh should be left to your Lordship's discretion;

That at length, in compliance with the representations and intreaties of the Duke of Portland, and of others, Lord Castlereagh's friends, and upon the most solemn assurances that Lord Castlereagh should in the mean time be prepared by his friends for the change, and that the change should positively take place at the period fixed by your Lordship, I consented to remain in office;

That on Wednesday the 6th of September, finding that nothing had been done towards preparing Lord Castlereagh for the arrangement; and that the execution of it would be attended with difficulties of which I had not before been apprized, I desired the Duke of

Portland to lay my resignation before the King.

Your Lordship will therefore perceive,

That up to the 8th of June, so far from being in possession of any "promise for Lord Castlereagh's removal," and from his continuance in office being made thereby "dependent upon my pleasure;"—no decision whatever had, to my knowledge, been taken, up to that time; no proposal had been made to me by the Duke of Portland, in any way affecting Lord Castlereagh's political situation: and no intimation had been given to me, whether my own resignation would be finally accepted or declined;

That the arrangement, which was in contemplation from the 8th of June, to the 5th of July, in no degree affected, and was never intended to affect, "the conduct of the Expedition to the Scheldt;"

That Lord Castlereagh's "removal from the War Department," was first determined upon as part of the plan of which your Lordship's Resignation was the basis;

That his "removal from the Administration" was not at any time "demanded" by me ;

And lastly, that I *did* employ the tender of my own resignation, not to "enforce the decision" *only* (as Lord Castlereagh's letter supposes), but equally to "enforce the disclosure;" and that in fact I did ultimately resign, rather than "enforce" the intended change, under circumstances so different from those which I had been authorized to expect.

It cannot be expected that I should labour very anxiously to refute the charge of my having "*supposed* your Lordship and others "*to be* Lord Castlereagh's *friends*;" and having, under that impression, deferred to your opinion and "authority," in a matter affecting Lord Castlereagh's interests and feelings.

That your Lordship, in particular, as well from near connection as from an active and anxious partiality, was entitled to consultation and to deference on such an occasion,—is a persuasion which I felt in common, as I believe, with every Member of the Government; and

which not even Lord Castlereagh's disclaimer has induced me to renounce.

I should not have been surprized, nor should I have thought myself entitled to take the smallest offence, if your Lordship had, instead of concurring in the expediency of a change in Lord Castlereagh's Department, protested against it, and had recommended to the Duke of Portland, to advise the King to accept my resignation : and it was perfectly known by the Duke of Portland, and I am confident, not unknown by your Lordship, that, at any moment from the beginning of these discussions to the end, I was not only ready but desirous to terminate them by resigning.

But when the opinion of the expediency of a change in the War Department had been adopted by so many of the immediate friends of Lord Castlereagh, upon the condition that it should be reconciled to Lord Castlereagh's feelings, and when they, and your Lordship among the first, had devised and concerted with the King's First Minister the mode of carrying that object into execution, I cannot help thinking that I should have been much,

and justly, blamed, if I had insisted upon taking the communication to Lord Castlereagh out of your hands into my own.

I now come to your Lordship's statement. That statement is as follows :—

“ As it may be inferred, from a statement
 “ which has appeared in the public papers,
 “ that Lord Camden withheld from Lord Cas-
 “ tlereagh a communication which he had
 “ been desired to make to him, it is necessary
 “ that it should be understood, that however
 “ Mr. Canning might have conceived the com-
 “ munication alluded to, to have been made to
 “ Lord Camden, it was never stated to Lord
 “ Camden that the communication was made
 “ at the desire of Mr. Canning ; and, so far
 “ from Lord Camden having been authorized
 “ to make the communication to Lord Castle-
 “ reagh, he was absolutely restricted from so
 “ doing.

“ As it may also be inferred that Lord
 “ Camden was expected to prepare Lord Cas-

“tlereagh’s mind for any proposed change, it
 “is necessary that it should be understood,
 “that Lord Camden never engaged to com-
 “municate to Lord Castlereagh any circum-
 “stances respecting it, before the termination
 “of the Expedition.”—*Morning Chronicle*,
October 10th.

This statement appears to me to have been much misunderstood. It has been construed, as if your Lordship had meant to aver that what you were *restricted from doing*, and what you *had not engaged to do*, were one and the same thing :—whereas your Lordship’s statement, in point of fact, contains two distinct propositions, and refers to two separate periods of time.

The period during which your Lordship states yourself to have been “*absolutely restricted*,” from making a communication to Lord Castlereagh, extends from the 28th of April, on which day the first communication was made by the Duke of Portland to your Lordship, to the time at which the proposed arrangement for the new distribution of the

business of the War Department was superseded by your Lordship's tender of your resignation.

The period during which your Lordship states yourself "*not to have engaged*" to make a communication to Lord Castlereagh, extends from the time of the tender of your Lordship's resignation to the termination of the Expedition to the Scheldt.

It ought, however, to be observed, that during the first of these two periods,—from the 28th of April to the 12th of July,—the nature of the communication to be made to Lord Castlereagh, and the nature of the restriction imposed upon your Lordship, were entirely changed.

Previously to the 8th of June—the communication which your Lordship would have had to make to Lord Castlereagh, was simply, that I had represented the expediency of a change either in his Department, or in mine; and that no decision whatever had yet been taken upon this representation.

With respect to *this* communication, it does appear that the restriction upon your Lordship was absolute and indefinite. But I knew nothing of its existence.

Subsequently to the 8th of June, the communication to be made to Lord Castlereagh was, that an arrangement was in contemplation for a new distribution of the business of the War Department.

With respect to *this* communication, not only was the *restriction* upon your Lordship not indefinitely continued; but your Lordship actually received on the 28th of June, an *injunction to make this communication* to Lord Castlereagh at a period distinctly specified, viz. the sailing of the Expedition. And this injunction was only superseded by a voluntary act of your Lordship's—your tender of your own resignation on the 12th of July, as the basis of another arrangement.

During the whole of the period, from the 28th of April to 12th of July, the concealment practised towards Lord Castlereagh was either without my knowledge, and contrary to

my belief, or it was against my earnest remonstrances.

It was without my knowledge and contrary to my belief, up to the week in which Parliament rose; and from that time forth it was against my earnest remonstrances.

Even when I learnt, in June, that the communication had not been made by your Lordship to Lord Castlereagh, I did not learn that you had been prevented from making it by any absolute restriction,

It was not till the month of July, in the course of the discussions which took place from the 13th to the 20th of that month, respecting the proposal for postponing the new arrangement to be founded on your Lordship's resignation, and for leaving to your Lordship's discretion the time of disclosure to Lord Castlereagh, that I learnt that the silence which you had hitherto observed towards him had been imposed upon your Lordship by the injunction of the Duke of Portland, I did not till then know with whom the concealment hitherto practised

had originated ; I frankly own that I thought it had originated with your Lordship ; I was anxious above all things that it should not be ever suspected that it had originated with me ; or that I had been a consenting party to it, or even (till a late period) conscious of its existence.

In my correspondence with the Duke of Portland at this period, therefore, at the same time that I resisted the new delay then proposed, I disclaimed any concurrence in the concealment which had been hitherto practised—and requested “that it might be remembered hereafter, whenever that concealment should be alleged against *me*, as an act of injustice to Lord Castlereagh, that it did not originate in *my* suggestion, that so far from desiring it I had conceived (however erroneously) *your Lordship* to be the sure channel of communication to Lord Castlereagh ; and that up to a very late period I had believed such communication to have been actually made.”

The Duke of Portland in answer acknow-

ledged my repeated remonstrances against the concealment; stating himself at the same time not to have been aware that I had at any time believed the communication to have been actually made; but assuring me “ that he should be at all times ready to avow that the concealment had originated with himself (the Duke of Portland); that he had *injoined it* to all those with whom he had communicated,—from motives which he was at all times ready to justify; and that he was desirous of taking whatever blame might have been, or might at any time be, incurred by it, upon himself.”

This, as I have said, was my first knowledge of any restriction whatever upon your Lordship’s communication to Lord Castlereagh.

If I am asked *why* I believed your Lordship to have *actually made* the communication?—I answer, because it was natural that you should make it; because the expectation of your making it was the motive which induced me to desire (and I *did* desire) that the communication should

be made to your Lordship ;—because the manner in which you first received that communication (as reported to me by the Duke of Portland) tended to confirm the belief that your Lordship was the fit channel of communication to Lord Castlereagh ;—and because I knew not of the existence of any impediment to your pursuing what appeared to me (and does still appear to me) the natural and obvious course to be pursued upon such an occasion.

If it be objected, that I ought not to have been contented with *presuming* the disclosure to have been made, but ought to have diligently ascertained that it was so ;—first, I answer, that no person naturally sets about ascertaining that of which he entertains no doubt : and, secondly, I answer, that the moment that my suspicion of the fact was excited, I did set about ascertaining the truth ; and that upon ascertaining it, I did remonstrate, in the strongest manner, against the concealment ;

and enforced that remonstrance by the tender of my resignation.

It was on the 26th or 27th of June, (five or six days after Parliament rose,) that I discovered my suspicion to be founded.—On the 27th, I remonstrated.—On the 28th, I tendered my resignation.—And in the course of the same day, your lordship (as I have already stated,) received an injunction to make the communication as soon as the Expedition should have sailed.

The second of the two periods to which your Lordship's statement refers, begins from the 12th of July, the day of the tender of your Lordship's resignation.

It does not appear, nor does your Lordship's statement aver, that at any time during this second period, the restriction which had been originally imposed upon your Lordship was

renewed; or that any other existed, except that which your Lordship had imposed upon yourself, and which was, therefore, no longer binding upon your Lordship than while you might yourself be willing that it should bind you.

Of the extent to which this *self-imposed* restriction appears to have gone, I had not any suspicion. I knew, indeed, that your Lordship had stipulated to keep the time of the disclosure to Lord Castlereagh in your own hands; but, subsequently to my being made acquainted with that stipulation, I had received the assurances, which I have already described, on behalf of "Lord Castlereagh's friends;" and had relied upon those assurances.

It was not till the 6th of September that I learnt that those assurances had not been carried into effect. It was not till the 19th of Sep-

tember that I learnt that your Lordship had been no party to them. Then, indeed, I learnt that your Lordship had not only “*not engaged*,” to make the communication previously to the “issue of the Expedition being known here”—but that in July you had “stated to one of our Colleagues” (not the Duke of Portland)—“*who was urging an earlier communication, that the time of communication, so far as you were concerned, was for you to decide ; but that no one had a right to say you did not perform that part in the transaction in which you were concerned, if you did not open your lips to Lord Castlereagh before the issue the Expedition was known here.*”

This information I received from your Lordship, in a letter dated the 19th of September. It was then perfectly new to me.

I leave your Lordship to judge what must have been my surprize, when, after receiving

from your Lordship, on the evening of the 19th of September, this frank avowal of the real origin of the concealment maintained, during this latter and most important period, towards Lord Castlereagh, I received, on the following morning, Lord Castlereagh's letter of the same date, making *me* responsible for that concealment.

I have not to trouble your Lordship with any farther observations.

I have confined myself to matters growing out of Lord Castlereagh's letter, and out of your Lordship's statement; on those alone have I any right to claim your Lordship's attention.

To this Address to your Lordship I have been compelled to resort, however reluctantly, to vindicate my private honour. As to any charges against my public conduct—this is not the mode to reply to them. If any such

shall be brought against me, at the proper time and in the proper place I shall be prepared to meet and to repel them.

I have the honour to be, with great respect,

My Lord, your Lordship's

Most obedient humble servant,

GEORGE CANNING.

FINIS.

LETTER

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
LORD VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH,

Military Establishment of the Country;

COMPARING

THE EXISTING SYSTEM

WITH

A PLAN SUBMITTED TO HIS LORDSHIP BY THE AUTHOR;

AND INQUIRING

WHETHER ITS FARTHER ADOPTION

WOULD NOT BE BENEFICIAL TO THE STATE:

WITH

REMARKS ON REGIMENTAL FINANCE.

*The Militia and Volunteer Services, the Importance of our
Military Strength, and the Impossibility of continuing
our Exertions from the Inadequacy of
the present Recruiting Means.*

By SAMUEL BRIDGE, Esq.

London:

Printed by Mercier and Co.
King's Head Court, St. Paul's Church Yard,
FOR KERBY, BOWDERY, AND BARBER,
NO. 190, OXFORD-STREET.

1809.

LETTER

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
LORD VISCOUNT CASTLEREAGH,
 &c. &c.

TO have been so fortunate as to anticipate one feature of a measure, which has occupied so much of your Lordship's attention, and which is thereby proved to be of the first moment to the state, is so gratifying to the humbler mind of mediocrity, as to re-animate its vanity, and lead it farther into the labyrinth of disquisition.

It is true, we are little able to judge of the merits of our own ideas; and as the parent, anxious to discover in its offspring a like

ness most congenial to her wishes, I may have deceived myself in the similitude, which, — I am flattered, exists, between the suggestions I had the honour to present to your notice, and the present military system of the country ; yet I shall write under that impression—I shall present the points from whence I have derived that opinion, consider wherein the systems vary, and investigate whether a nearer assimilation would not be beneficial to the state.

Every year, nay, even month, we advance, since the horrors of the French Revolution, and the reign of tyranny, which has sprung from the ashes of rebellion, produces some new event, to call forth the energy of this country, either to defend herself against the tyrant, or to aid the general cause of liberty and virtue, by seconding the efforts of others, and nurturing the tender plant of freedom, wherever it

takes root, without regard to sect or climate, by directing all our force to accomplish their emancipation; and, in the succession of events, which this tremendous epoch of the world presents, there is none in which the soul of liberty appears to have inspired, none on which the pen of history will dare to apostrophize, but the glorious and immortal efforts which begin to illumine the enslaved world, if not to dethrone—I trust, to set limits to the impudent stock of modern majesty, and confine it to its proper jurisdiction, viz. the dastardly set, who voluntarily crouch to such imperial mockery and usurpation.

Thus the military objects of this country are more extended; her force of greater weight in the general scale of good; her efforts, the guardian of the expanding torch of liberty, which is fanned into flame by her friendship, and which can only be kept alive by the most vigorous co-operation.

On these general principles, I have considered the military establishment of the nation, and viewing it as finite for offensive warfare, that on which we are now called to engage, it is defective, being inadequate to a continued continental assistance ; under this conviction, a review of our resources, and an inquiry into the means of urging them to their utmost extent, cannot be deemed an unprofitable investigation.

The universal sentiment which pervades all ranks of people ; the enthusiastic joy, which for the moment even neutralizes the long-borne calamity of war, and extends the exultation of victory from the political circles to the cottage of industry and obscurity, promises a ready concurrence in the whole population to accelerate the objects of our governors in their praise-worthy zeal to further the Spanish patriots, and restore the rights of national independence to the fettered world. It is a

happy truth, that we have not to deplore its loss ; but in a contagion so general, although we stand firm among the wreck of nations, we owe our preservation to a vigilance and exertion, which may ultimately enervate the source from whence they are derived ; and although no gloomy prospects should disarm us of fortitude, by rearing the phantoms of disaster, in periods however distant, we should not confidently wait till it approaches our shores, but exert ourselves to administer to the distresses of others ; for by relieving them, we remove the possibility of infection from ourselves.

The observations which I transmitted to your Lordship last year, were formed on the following grounds ;—that a considerable military force was necessary, for the defence and future prosperity of the country ; that, that force should as nearly as possible approach the description of our regular troops ;

that the volunteer force was not only absolutely inefficient but prejudicial to the other branches of military servitude; and that, as it was contrary to the genius of Englishmen to become soldiers, from the independance and liberty which they inhale in this happy land with their first breath, it was essential to have recourse to the only obligatory service admissible in free states, viz. calling on the population for home defence; that by reconciling them to the habits of soldiers, by compulsory local service, the army might be reinforced from such corps, by the influence of bounty, the force of example, and the indifference of many, (who, being obliged to serve,) how far that service is extended,

On viewing the occupation of the general mass, four or five hundred thousand men were considered soldiers, by being merely called so; they were not only completely inefficient as a

corps, but injurious to the other branches, by engrossing a greater part of the community, who, adhering to the prejudices of military life, attached themselves to that description of service as a shield from the only obligatory duty which their country could enforce; and the grievance of their establishment was heightened by a variety of exemptions, increasing the public burthens of others, and by an expenditure, for which they were not in a situation to afford the smallest recompensing good. The most obvious point, therefore, first to be accomplished was the annihilation of this honorary chivalry; for, by so doing, it restored to the body, from whence the law had authority to demand, a number equal, if properly acted on, for the full purposes of not only security to ourselves, but the probable glory of the emancipation of others.

It was unquestionably a measure requiring much caution and respect; for,

although unsuccessful in their zeal, that zeal was not the less honourable: and in the first instance, till those who, having no stake, but the common one of protection, from the mildness and munificence of our law, and who, for such protection, having nothing but personal service to tender as an equivalent, should have swelled the ranks of a more active phalanx; the volunteers presented to the world, that Britain had not only soldiers in her cause, but she had also a band of freemen, composed of her citizens, whose civil duties, from their higher situation in society, proscribed them from the more professional employments of the field, but who were so unanimous in patriotism and loyalty, as to clothe themselves in the attire of war, and shut out the most distant conception of dissension, indifference, or disaffection. They were as him, who bears the colours of a friendly party, and who, though but little able to facilitate success, evinces an interest, which prevents the mis-

calculation of his influence to exhilarate the hopes of an opponent.

The volunteers, as thus originally organized, were productive of material good; their name was the pass-word for every patriot and loyalist; it was an electric spark, which ran through all honest hearts instantaneously; and by shewing, in an immense list of half a million men, how truly liberty was revered, it left nothing for the dæmons of anarchy and sedition to hope, if they still lurked around the hallowed and honoured soil, where, it so triumphantly blossoms; but when they attracted that description of men, more applicable for the other branches of the service, they became prejudicial, and required re-organizing or disbanding.

Your Lordship has succeeded in achieving this reformation, without having hurt.

their feelings, wounded their honour, or rendered them neutral and indifferent to the general good. For though no violent hand has been laid on their establishment; the funeral pile is prepared for their commissions and appointments; and the conflagration is only delayed, till those who chuse have changed their name, and the 60,000 new militia are embodied;—that I am authorized in congratulating myself on this event, I have only to consider the circumstances of their possible continuation. They are permitted to become local militia, they are not only permitted, but requested, and a bounty is tendered to them to assent. If this local militia was but commensurate to their present duties; if in the scale of general benefit, their servitude in either was equally efficient: there is a prodigality in this expenditure of the public purse; but I am too aware of the inflexible austerity with which the pecuniary transactions of the present day

are managed, to attribute this additional charge to any other source, than your Lordship's acquiescence in the ideas which I have promulgated, that volunteers cannot become useful as soldiers, and that a bounty is well employed, if it can convert them to a more manageable and disposeable force.

It is true, there is still the floating fabric of such an army, but it has been deprived of all support, and like the condemned edifice, which has cost millions to erect, and whose unproportioned walls, tottering on their foundation, require fortuitous support ; the removal of such coadjutors is sufficiently prophetic of its destruction, without the necessity of labour, to rase the very remembrance of its existence.

.

Withdrawing pay from some, offering bounty to others, affixing new regulations and restrictions, rendering the ser-

vice more burthensome and less profitable, will do as much towards their dismissal, as a general peace, or the powerful mandates of his Majesty.

Thus far your Lordship has certainly coincided with my assertions.—I shall pursue the subject, by considering the objects of the classification I proposed, and whether such classification is marked in your Lordship's measure.

I stated that the object being for general defence, its operation should be universal, proving that even the tenaciousness of our rights admitted the obligation of all to defend our shores. As 500,000 volunteers had been enrolled, or nearly so; that number was selected, as allowing no doubts of the capability of the country to that extent, and the appropriation of that number was formed, agreeable to the exigencies of the state, but still con-

sistent with the occupations of the community. The object to be attained was of a two-fold nature ; to be secure at home, (by conscription, if local service can be tortured into so harsh a form) formidable abroad, by periodical calls, in small numbers, comparative to the total to be received from, the reasonable use of bounty, and other incitements, in which men, once soldiers, are readily induced to concur. It was proposed to present a scale from the lowest to the highest military duty, and to connect the whole in one chain, that there might be a connecting medium, not requiring the interference of power, or the formation of occasional acts of parliament, which tend to create a jealousy and doubt in the minds of those who are to be subject to their operation.

.

As an ultimate end, in inviting soldiers for home service, was foreign duty, it was essential to have as nearly as pos-

sible, that description of men, who were likely to be acted on by the inducement offered ; to accomplish which, exchanges were indispensable ; for by confining those to service, whom the ballot selected, it either brought a description, whom bounty could not swerve, from the independance of their situation, or by exempting such by fine, instead of substitute, it left the measure uncertain, as to the numbers of men it was to produce ; while for those, not fit from age, or personal defects, or could not be spared, from the number of their family, for the more active duties, but who had a right to bear a proportion in the general defence, a class was instituted for their employment, exempting them from extended service, but training them under martial law, that in the event of their exertions being necessary, they might be incorporated with the corps embodied.

Thus two distinct classes arose from this

body of 500,000 men ; the one for the service of a militia, embodied twice in a year, cloathed, armed, and regimented ; from which the established militia was to be completed, and which was to be the stock, from whence the regular army was to be augmented ; for if the number necessary to supply the disposable force, could not be induced by bounty to enlist, the old militia was to be thrown open to complete the requisite quota : and the vacancies occasioned in the latter, those who had refused to volunteer for the line were to fill by ballot ; as the number, including the old militia, would be 300,000 ; one in thirty, three per company of ninety men, on each assembly, would produce twenty thousand per year for the line ; in addition to which, as the staff of each corps of the description called the second class, was to be constantly embodied, and as the whole of the men of their regiments were permitted to enlist at pleasure into the regular army ; the

recruiting establishment of the country would be encreased, to the extent of 22,000 men, without taking from the more active duties of war, men for disposeable service ; and as the authority of such must be greater over their own men, than the indiscriminate influence of common parties over those in no way connected with them, and as they would have the stimulus of reward, in proportion to their success, a very considerable excess may be calculated on ; so that at least 30,000 men would be annually recruited for the line.

The next general principle was to preserve an equal operation on the whole population, so that each should contribute in proportion to his means, either by servitude with or without pay ; or for exemption, by contributing separately, for the expense incurred for their defence.

With this view it was proposed, that the original list should include all who had any stake in the final issue of the cause, not only those fit for the personal operations of war, not only those whose situations pointed them out as the most proper for the lower ranks of military servitude, but also the powerful, the wealthy, and even those who, although having passed the period of life for such exertions, were from property enabled to contribute exclusively for the protection they derived from the service of others.

It was found on estimate, that the annual expense for this establishment would amount to 2,500,000*l.* per year, and throwing this charge on those not included in the 500,000 composing the two classes, by enrolling one million, and attaching a fine for exemption, equal on an aggregate to 5*l.* per man, it raised the annual expenditure.

The outlines were therefore :—A million of men to be enrolled, half to pay a yearly fine of 5*l.* for exemption, voluntarily, or if necessary a greater number offering by ballot;—of the remaining half,—a moiety to serve in their parishes, trained by the officers, &c. of the other moiety, to be selected by ballot, placing those primarily on such list, who were poor and had large families, who were below the height proper for the regular army, or who had any trifling infirmity (and no power of commuting), which, although rendering them unfit for the more extended service, did not make them useless in the various other departments of war, should so large a force ever be embodied. The remainder was to be the mother-trunk of military service, to be regimented, and embodied periodically, its non-commissioned officers in constant pay ; it was to complete the militia, supply the line, and by its operation totally supersede the farther

interference of Parliament on any future emergency.

I shall consider how far this plan has been resembled, by the subsequent measure ; to accomplish which I shall assume, as admitted by your Lordship, that the two assertions made as introductory to the necessity of reformation, were founded in truth, viz. that the volunteer establishment was not only inefficient, but prejudicial ; and that limited service would require all the exertions of the state to replace those to be hereafter discharged, without leaving the possibility, under any circumstances, of a permanent encrease to the standing army.

In the first of these conclusions I am justified by the principles of your Lordship's Bill ; a new militia, for local service, is to be raised, to amount, in the first instance, to 60,000, but to be encreased to 300,000,

in proportion as the volunteers diminish, and not only thus anticipating, but hastening their dissolution by the introduction of new regulations and restrictions. And in the second I am equally authorized by the last Mutiny Act, allowing men to enlist for life, and by the late orders, giving to such men an additional bounty of five guineas ; thus there appears a manifest acquiescence as to the fundamental errors of the preceding system ; I shall endeavour to trace, whether, in the improvements introduced, there are any corresponding features.

First with regard to numbers—it was suggested, that in addition to the Old Militia, 250,000 men should be raised, creating a total of 300,000. The mode of calculating in the new system, although varying in form, presents the same number, so that in the extent of this description of force, there is also an evident coincidence. It is true, in the mode

of constituting this force there is some variation; the principle which I proposed leaves no possible doubt, no practicable evasion, by which the product can be lessened. The net fourth of the general mass of one million, much below the capability of the country, and selected from those best adapted for service, being appropriated in the parishes, independent of every casualty. The whole of this force, as comprised in the second class, was not only to give periodically volunteers, but all were to be permitted to enlist at pleasure; a connection was created from the lowest to the highest description of duty, and a stimulus (by means of rewards to those in power, viz. the non-commissioned officers, &c.) was offered to excite the removal from one branch to the other, that ultimately many might reach that, the most useful and distinguished. In your Lordship's arrangement, although not noticing the periodical call recommended, the latter régime

lation is adopted, with no other distinction than to permit men to extend their obligation, when disembodied. If, as I have offered, that Englishmen are averse to military habits, from their love of liberty, and the independence of their situations—if it is necessary not only to reconcile them to such restrictions, but also to exhort and coax them to an extension of their duty, simply giving them *the indulgence* of taking a more exposed and laborious task in the defence of their country, will do but little towards recruiting the ranks of our regular army.

The next mode of resemblance is to be found under the head of Fines; in the suggestions it is recommended to demand a yearly sum as an exemption from service, and it is proposed that some 'modification may be introduced to regulate the sum to the circumstances of the persons paying. In your Lordship's measure this has been acted on,

although varying from the original principle on which such fines were founded, viz. that they should exclusively attach to those who wished not to serve the state in person, as well as those who, although unfit for military duty, were from property in a situation to pay for the protection they derived from others. Your Lordship exacts fines as exemptions from service—apportion them according to the circumstances of the persons paying: and (as was proposed) appropriate their use to the support of the measure from whence they are derived. In fact, the material difference between the two plans exists in these points—1st, Raising but 250,000 additional to the militia, instead of two classes, each of that strength; the one for similar duty to the local militia (as called by your Lordship's Bill), the other for more confined action; and for the employment of those who, although useful in any eventual struggle for our liberty, are many of them unfit for the

active duties of the profession, or have such calls on their presence at home, from family, &c. as to be better selected for a less military description of service.

2dly, That while the fines of your Lordship's bill fall on those ballotted, and are taken as exemption from service, the measure does not attach so generally as to include many of large property, who ought to pay exclusively for its safety, as a commensurate obligation to those who are called on for personal duty, and by proscribing substitution, leaves the number of men to be raised, vague, and impossible to be determined.

3dly, The description of men, confining it to narrower bounds than the old militia; exempting a man from the lesser duty because he is 35, and leaving him liable for the more burthensome, because he is not 40.

4thly, The want of improvement in the regulations of the old militia, as applying to the non-commissioned officers, to be kept in pay ; they being deficient in number, inefficient in duty, and rather an injury than a good, to the propagation of military habits.

Lastly, the want of connection between the various branches of the service ; there being no immediate channels, which appear to lead necessarily from the original description of duty, *viz.* the larger body, and less serviceable ; to the more enterprising, more useful, and more honorable ; leaving each corps dependant on chance, casual exertion, momentary caprice, or occasional parliamentary interference ; and by locking up a larger proportion of the community than formerly, without pointing out the road, to clear away the prejudices to military habits, the disposeable

force will be rather lessened than augmented. To consider these points, to investigate the grounds of this variation, to endeavour to controvert them, by a consideration of the probable benefits of a more extended assimilation ; are the objects of the present inquiry.

The first three shades of difference may be more properly considered under one head ; as they are all comprised in the general principle which first recommended the project : and which is inseparable from the magnitude of the object : *viz.* the danger of the state, and that invaluable blessing, our liberty. This principle is universality, that all should participate equally in the common cause ; the rich by payment ; the middling and commercial class by being trained at home, without recompense : and the labouring, and less important in domestic life, by a more active line of duty to be remunerated

from the purses of those exempt. This payment, and this service should be distinct from the usual operation of our ordinary obligations; it should be exclusive, as the man who chooses a separate watchman to his door, pays over and above all other parochial charges, for the separate protection he derives; thus A. B. C. and D. requiring one guard: A. and B. should pay exclusively, D. who remains an out-door centinel; while C. discharges his part of the trust by being armed, and in attendance to assist, if called on; and which is equalised in the scale of obligation by his receiving nothing. It may be alleged, that as the volunteers are deemed prejudicial, what preference can the class have, who are trained at home, and if useless, why trouble so large a portion of society? That volunteers are detrimental, has arisen from innovation; when confined to those, who were unfit, or unlikely to engage for more active duties, they were serviceable.

by giving a general countenance to the cause, and proving the unanimity with which Britons contended. But above this value, as existing at their formation, the description of the first class possesses the powers of many prominent advantages ; their mode of training more certainly productive of good, by the authority with which it was to be enforced ; its ulterior use in filling the ranks of the more efficient body, if necessity or danger demanded it ; its creating an employment for those who could not be exempt without producing jealousy, and thereby separating such as from person were useless, or from obligations as heads of families, could not be spared for the disposable force of the country ; for the object being of a two-fold nature, security at home, respect and honour abroad ; it was essential to have the class, from whence all the higher orders of military servitude was to be derived, composed of men fit for the

hardy enterprise of soldiers; and this could only be obtained by swelling the original list, and sifting from it those the least efficient. In the organization of the local militia, this defect will be readily apparent: men of the height of 5 feet 2 inches are admitted, and if in a corps of 1,000 men, one hundred only, are of this stature, you reduce the number to supply the line a tenth, and in any call for reinforcement, encrease the ratio without augmenting the product.

This is but one of the descriptions, which, although fit for some military service, is not admissible in the line, and the class, by receiving *ab initio* all objectionable subjects, leaves the second body efficient for the ulterior objects of the measure, and by employing all, puts down the possibility of dissatisfaction. The view of the operation of the proposed plan, on any given numbers of men, will make these observations unanswerable. One hundred names compose the original list,

50 are permitted to commute by paying exclusively for the expense of the defence of their total number, 25 are selected for servitude at home, till urgent necessity calls them to the field; this selection receiving previous to the ballot, all persons ineligible for the disposable force; it leaves the remaining 25, more certainly fit for the duty of soldiers, than if only that number had been the total, originally demanded. If therefore the measure of defence was to act equally, it must apply to every gradation in society; if it was to form a nursery for the old militia, and ultimately for the line, it was requisite to separate those called on by such universality, who were unfit for extended service, so as to leave the corps, constituting the grand source of military duty, composed of subjects fit to discharge its obligation.

It may be urged, that admitting the class, as thus formed, to possess more men applicable for the line, than an equal body of the local

militia; yet there would exist a considerable proportion in the latter, of soldiers of that description. To this, the present employment of our troops; the extent of our military exertions, and the probable reinforcements such enterprises will require, present the objections to such an inference. The ordinary casualties in our army are 14,000 annually; from 70 to 80 thousand men are in our colonies; 50 to 60 now in Spain and Portugal: and 30,000 therefore cannot be considered an extravagant calculation for its indispensable yearly supply during its present service.

If therefore the militia, formed almost indiscriminately of all kinds of men, to the amount of 250,000: one third of that number, although possessing the inclination, could not be received into the line: it is a fair ratio, to consider, on any burst of a general offer for volunteers, one in thirty will engage: if the total was 180,000, and there were two periods in the year,

12,000 only would be produced ; thus the separation of those unfit, from the body to be urged to extend their duty, not only renders the corps more useful in their native cast, and less expensive ; but also promises a greater success in its ulterior object, recruiting the line.

On this computation, there is every reasonable ground to appreciate success in a more extended adoption of the plan I had the honour to recommend. The total force to volunteer from would be 300,000 men, all fit for the regular army. One in thirty on each assembly would give twenty thousand yearly by its natural operation, without inroads or alterations ; and by using the whole staff of the body (except the old militia), and adopting the regulations of rewards, &c. there is not a doubt, but at least the remaining ten thousand would be recruited. The last volunteering from the militia proved the inexpediency of calling for a greater num-

ber than were inclined to enlist ; it created a torpor in entire regiments, soldiers were jealous, and while on former occasions, where but few men were demanded, they anxiously pressed forward to acquire a preference, in this, they were indifferent, some corps passed several periods before the quotas were completed ; and in many regiments are considerably deficient at this moment.

Of the application of fines there appears an error incompatible with the spirit of the institution : if the country had wanted money, or military service, and it was indifferent which the measure produced, fines for exemption or soldiers would have been equally beneficial. But if money is secondary to our honour and our independence, and that all the riches of the world cannot secure them, without an immense armed force ; the prohibition of substitution, and the power of evading personal duty, are subversive of the military provisions of the bill.

If on a ballot for 10 men, the number required by any parish, all paid the fine, the state may be enriched, but has not at all improved its means of defence. The introduction of this clause is to be deduced from the fear of injuring the ordinary recruiting service, and the mischief of such a tendency could not be tolerated, unless it established a more permanent, a more productive, and a less variable system, to accomplish the same desirable ends. It requires no arguments to prove, that the common recruiting regulations are not one half so productive as the calculation I have stated, in the most favourable times, in the dearth of agriculture, and the suspension of manufactories, the number acquired scarcely fills the common casualties of the year; therefore the principle of this restriction is rendered nugatory, by the evil producing a greater good, than the full powers of the measure which it was intended to protect.

Even in a military view, so far from approving of the prohibition of exchanges, I consider men serving as principals generally inimical to military pre-eminence. You want an army—a regular army; you discover men will not enlist, that your happy laws forbid conscription, and that you are obliged, to the subterfuge of using the power which free states admit; calling on men for home defence, and then, by reconciling them to military habits, inflaming some with the glow of ardour, inspiring a sense of shame, of having done nothing in deeds of war, although attired as the defenders of their country, and offering a bounty seasonably, you induce them to become the force you wish. Therefore better to have the tradesman's man as his substitute, than the tradesman as a principal himself. The tradesman will be more useful in civil life, and the man more likely to be useful to the state: a corps of substi-

tutes is worth, for military exploits, two regiments of principals ; they have less independence, therefore less personal indulgence, and in proportion more obedience and more activity. In the long detail of a soldier's duty, there are many necessary employments of fatigue, which would be highly distressing to numbers on whom the ballot would fall, in which they would think the country not much benefitted, but which are as essential as their more honourable occupations ; and hence it is favourable to the military character, to have the lower offices of the profession confined to those, whose circumstances and situation have not placed them above their execution.

It is true, such may pay the fine, but then an injury of another nature is produced.

The only possible objection to substitution, is competition for bounty, and

if its increase does not lessen the number of men raised for the line under all the views of its operation, it is of an insignificant import; it should be restricted; and there are limits which may protect the principal from extortion, and remunerate and induce substitutes to serve. For without exchanges, you must either fail in number, or have men of property serving, who will neither enlarge their sphere of duty, or peaceably conform to military habits; but who, by having higher notions of ease and enjoyment, will diffuse dissatisfaction among their comrades, and distract, if not subvert, the desideratum of their selection. If this is to be avoided by any distinction, it will create a jealousy at the preference they have received, and therefore, on any view of the subject, the prohibition is prejudicial and proscriptive.

The limitation of these fines affords another objection; all men in a civil consi-

deration have reciprocal duties to perform ; it is fair that the lower orders should fill the ranks ; but the higher should not be exempt from penalty, because they are above the operation of personal enactment : by enrolling the whole population, all contribute : the minister, the peer, the man of property, who, although past the period of personal defence, has still a right to contribute to such protection. But by calling on 60,000 only, and excluding, according to the militia laws, all the higher ranks, the measure virtually attaches to those, who have a minor stake in the eventual termination : not that I mean to estimate lightly the splendid advantages, which are comprised in the simple name of English liberty : but as that treasure is universally diffused, and as the more exalted have many lively tints to heighten its brilliancy ; why should they not be included in the contest for its preservation ? To say they contribute generally,

does not reply to the question ; it is an exclusive call for our lives, our religion, and our liberty, and should be exclusively supported by those who do not defend, but are defended.

The next ground of difference is the age of persons liable to the ballot for the new militia ; and here I am at a loss for an interpretation. If the service was in its obligatory state more burthensome, it would justify the innovation : if it was clear that all would become regular soldiers, before their time of servitude ended, it would render it highly beneficial ; but, as it is (according to the existing plan) the mildest military service, and as it cannot be thought the total will have volunteered before the termination of four years, it appears capricious and unnecessary.

A man is drawn for the local militia, is discharged at 35, and although above the

age, when his interregnum of exemption is passed for that home service, he is eligible to be ballotted into the active duty of the embodied militia. The reverse would appear political and just, for a man at forty may be better adapted to occasional military pursuits than to their constant occupation : and although I would have the men of the 2d class (as I have termed them) fit for the service of the line, I would have it strengthened and improved by the example derived from the return of such men as had served, and were liberated from the higher branches of the service ; who might be capable of transacting its local obligations, and encouraging the younger to pursue their honourable track. This is completely controverted by the restrictions of the new measure.

I am aware that it will be urged, the duration of service, and the limitation of age were to be equipoises to the prohibition of

substitution ; but that is chimerical ; for he is only discharged, to be the almost immediate subject, of another ballot, and for a more extended, although involuntary service, with the only consideration of being then allowed to injure the recruiting service in a proportional degree by procuring a proxy.

I proceed under the fourth head, to the examination of the old militia establishment relative to its disembodied state, its number of non-commissioned officers and their employment, and the comparative view of such service under the suggestions which I proposed.

In times of peace a moiety of the non-commissioned officers and drummers of the old militia, together with the adjutant and a quarter-master were kept in constant pay, to accelerate the perfection of the corps in the event of being embodied : the former, were selected by the colonel, without retro-

spect to military duty, for musical talents, as ornamental country appendages to civic feasts and rural galas, and were left at leisure to pursue their harmonious avocations with scarcely the recollection of their primitive obligations ; and, excepting the adjutant, who, being left without the means of doing good, became himself useless, there is not a vestige in the old militia habits, to look for the smallest advantages, for the sums expended, in their disembodied state.

The addition of a quarter-master to the charge, by no means benefitted the establishment ; it only added another civil appendage to the corps, whose duty would have been as well transacted by the battalion clerk, or more properly by the adjutant, whose pay is inadequate in peace, to recompense the zeal, which his situation then requires.

Let me review the proposed duty of

the non-commissioned officers of the description, called the 2d class, when that corps was disembodied: each regiment was to have an establishment of 100 men, constituting a company, officered by the adjutant and a subaltern, doing military duty, and when their other avocations permitted, incorporated with similar companies, forming a battalion, and augmenting the home defence.

The force of military habits, the constant operation of martial authority, would so mould them into soldiers, as to render their corps speedily effective when embodied; but this advantage by no means comprised the sphere of their occupations; they were to train the men of the 1st class, of the parishes from whence their respective battalions were obtained; they were to act as a permanent recruiting staff, not indiscriminately disposed, but directing their exertions to the regiment to which they belonged.

where, from the interest resulting from success, they would learn the utility of being popular and having influence,

In this employment there are innumerable resulting benefits, their number of 23,000 would supersede the necessity of all other recruiting parties; the home defence would not only be increased by their enrolment, but the disposeable force augmented by the liberation of those on whom the present duty at present falls. A considerable saving would arise in the general expenditure from the recruiting disbursements being defrayed by this partial revenue; the military finance would be simplified; and the confused and complicated restrictions of the present* mode of recruiting, which torture those you would invite, would be superseded.

* The appropriation of districts, and the routine a recruit marches, before he joins his regiment, is more particularly alluded to.

A few regulations would carry on the whole recruiting service both for the militia and the line, and the legislature of the country, instead of devoting their talents from year to year to enlarge our military power, and sometimes undermining the purity of its establishment, by the introduction of new-fangled opinions, for objects of popularity, or for the indulgence of some volatile ephemera, would be able to direct their judgment to increase our resources, harmonise our interior, consolidate our code, (now mischievously extended,) and attain the art of diplomatique finesse, that we may be able in the foreign cabinet, to do justice to our strength, in any future treaties, the government may engage in.

The effect of this theory may appear more conclusive by a practical instance of its adoption; supposing the number of regular battalions to be 200, as there would be

225 corps of the 2d class, each corps of the line would have a regiment of 1,000 men to complete its casualties, while there would be a surplus of 25, for the other branches of the service; the battalions thus appropriated, to receive a connecting number or name, to the regiments, they are to supply, that an interest may be established between them, and that the men, by having their former comrades in a particular corps, may be induced to give it a decided preference; not that it should be stipulated that they should select no other, but that every inducement may be urged, to direct their views to that, apportioned to them.

Each battalion of the line, to have a subaltern, and two or three non-commissioned officers stationed at a general depot, to be established in the centre of districts of a prescribed extent, that there may be a ready communication with the parishes, which fur-

nish their reserve battalion, and that recruits may be received without the inconvenience to them of long marches, before they are incorporated in their new service, or to the public, from the riot and insubordination which attend their intermediate state. Forty or fifty miles are inconsiderable, and by extending in all points, embrace a large body of the population, and would be an object of such magnitude, as to justify its attendant expense; the men volunteering would be transferred at a particular date to the regiments which they entered, and thus the periods of such casualties would be readily examined and corrected; those enlisting, the adjutant or subaltern of the 2d class, whom it is proposed to reward for every recruit obtained, would advance a requisite sum, to forward them to the depot, which being reimbursed by the paymaster, on their arrival, would obviate the possibility of any man's appearing for pay, &c. on any rolls

but that of the regiment to which he belongs; these pay lists of detachments being kept distinct, and vouched by the field officer, which it is proposed to attach to each depot, would be transmitted to the regiment, if in Great Britain, or to the agent, if the corps was on foreign service, and incorporated in the regimental accounts, while the bounty, being defrayed by this particular revenue, would constitute a distinct account, from the depot paymaster, and thus separate the recruiting disbursements from the ordinary expenditures.

The appointment of a staff to each depot is indispensable, and this staff consisting, in addition to the field officer, of a captain, subaltern, adjutant and paymaster, would receive all men offering for other regiments, not apportioned to their district, facilitate their removal to the corps selected, farther the equipment of the whole, and

afford sufficient checks to every irregularity. As the recruiting officer would be stationary, arms, accoutrements, and cloathing might be in store, and corps on service would thus not only be supplied with reinforcements, but they could be sent in such numbers, and equipment as to preclude the necessity of relieving them, if their destination was important and distant.

The proximity of these depots to the homes of the men, the constant residence around the neighbourhood, of the non-commissioned officers of the 2d class, who enlisted them, would check desertion; as the soldier would be aware he could not return to his friends, from the certainty of being detected.

.

As the number of regiments of the old militia is less than the battalion of the line, and as they are to bear their share, in the event of failure, in the 2d class to sup-

ply the requisite quota; some connection agreeable to the different strengths of those services should be attempted; it will not be possible to appropriate to each battalion of regulars, a battalion of old militia, but perhaps the number of corps in that establishment would allow one for a regiment. According to this plan, the several services could be thus distinguished. All corps of the line to have local names, those of militia, to bear the number of the line regiment, which they were in preference to recruit, and the second class to be similarly distinguished, adding reserve or local, and the particular battalion of the line they were to reinforce:—Thus there would be the first and second battalion, 44th East Essex Regiment, to be furnished with men generally by the East Essex (or 44th militia), if the reserve battalion failed; also primarily, according to the battalions, by the first and second East Essex, Local, or 44th militia.

The operation of this exchange of duty, would be facilitated by, the company of the local corps, remaining among the men who were to be the subjects of their exertion, (except when their corps was incorporated for improvement), and the subaltern and party of the line, stationed at the depot; and by selecting this officer invariably from the senior subalterns, and thereby pointing out the certain road to their promotion, it will lead to exertions, not usually met with in the ordinary appointment of officers for the old recruiting service; if there required any additional stimulus to urge men to enlist, the exclusive acceptance of officers from the militia and second class, as ensigns in the line, would create considerable interest; not the capricious exercise of this indulgence, dependant on influence or favouritism, but as a matter of seniority, if a named proportion enlisted, confining their appointment to the county corps, to extend and cement the union

between the different services; excluding none, but such as were unable to transact the duties of more extended obligations.

This certainty of obtaining a commission in the line, would tend to increase the number, if not improve in a military view, the description of subalterns in the militia itself; for as the great incitement for such service, now, is the annual stipend they are to receive when disembodied, there are all ages, from the school-boy, in those appointments.

The employment in the second class, of all those discharged from the regular service with pensions, whose infirmities or age leave them the capability of further military duty, (such as constitute the present veteran battalions,) would familiarize the one service, to the habits and feelings of the other; thus, many would return to the corps from which they originally enlisted, the fear

of sharing their difficulties, would be overbalanced by the vanity, of wishing to partake of their glory, and the florid tale of victory, which the old soldier never tires relating, would tend to create that military zeal, which, as a nation, we are too little alive to; and their introduction would not lessen the capability of the force, as they would join as supernumeraries, without producing any alteration in the original lists.

These outlines result from materials too vague, to set positive limits to the appropriation of the different services, so as to produce all the benefits I have proposed, but a more detailed adjustment would readily arise, from a comparative view of the number of corps, of the several branches, and as the experiment would lead to no one obstacle, to future arrangements, however speculative, it might be attempted.

I have not entered into a full consider-

ation of all the provisions the plan embraces ; the mode of replacing casualties, in the second class, the use of those to be trained at home, and the annual supply to cover the number volunteering, are detailed in the previous publication, and I only allude to them in this place, to avert the observations which would arise from my silence, on such important points of a permanent military establishment.

But I do not even stop here in the good which may result from such an undertaking ; the importance of military finance has been so generally admitted, and the jealous attention which that subject has claimed from the public during a period, when its expenditure has been augmented to nearly twenty millions annually, that any plan embracing a clearer and readier mode of accounts would on that ground recommend itself to notice. The only two points in finance to be accomplished, are checks to prevent fraud, and

punctuality in examination to detect it, without the latter, the first is nugatory; and if the restrictions to enforce rectitude are so diffuse as to preclude prompt and regular investigation, they will in many cases be proscriptive of the very good for which they were intended.

I do not pretend that the adoption of this system would remedy all the defects in that department: some of them, and those very important, would be removed, and lessening the difficulties would smooth the road for the examination of those which remained.

It is of little use receiving pay lists from 500 men, if their accounts, requiring more time to examine than form, are to be looked at, by only forty or fifty individuals. The necessary accumulation will be such, that in one year, they will have ten years employ; so that the second year's vouchers cannot be

examined till the 20th, and the third, till the 30th, after their completion. I do not present this as an exact scale, but I believe that in ten years, since the introduction of the new system, none have been finally passed, and that many have not been even looked at: the fact is, they are so voluminous, particular, and complicated, that all the industry and talents of the most able arithmeticians, cannot possibly get through them in any tolerable season.

I shall not confine myself to those errors, which the proposed plan will remedy, but I shall endeavour to detail other imperfections, and venture to offer some hints for their correction.

The first ground of objection, is the bulk of the accounts; the second, their complicated form; and the third, the voluminous code, extending to 600 pages, through which every item of charge is to be investigated.

The removal of recruiting disbursements, from the regimental pay-lists, and the abolition of all district accounts resulting from the detail of the system I am recommending, would considerably diminish the first difficulty.

In the existing mode of paying bounties, a recruit being inlisted in Ireland, receives a proportion; from whence he is removed, perhaps, to the Isle of Wight, where he has a further payment: and then again, on joining his regiment, the remainder: while beyond even this, the reward to party forms another claim in the district where he enlisted. Thus the charge of bounty for one individual instead of standing in one sum and in one account, is extended to several, and requires as much time to examine and check, against the several accountants, according to the forms of minute appropriation, and prescribed certificates, as the necessary expenditure of a company.

The annihilation of district accounts is indispensable, and the project of establishing depots, and excluding such pay-masters from all accounts with government, except for bounty, and charging even that in one sum for each recruit, to be passed by a distinct department, having the superintendence of the fines, from whence the charge is to be defrayed, afford equal convenience to the service, without any of those impediments which at present clog the financial machine.

Thus far in reform the plan of itself extends: but it is not, I confess, sufficient; the pay-lists would be still too bulky, the forms too intricate, and the orders, although despoiled of recruiting beauties, too prolix for promptness and simplicity.

The introduction of quarterly, instead of the monthly pay-lists, has done something towards reducing the number of de-

tailed accounts, but this advantage has been lessened by the substitution of monthly abstracts, more diffuse than accuracy demands, and the use of more difficult forms for the several periods.

In the old mode of finance, pay-lists were received but twice in a year, and it is clear, that plan must be again resorted to; to achieve the wishes of government, relative to the examinations of the public accounts; the checks which have been introduced are many of them highly expedient, and when coupled with half yearly pay-lists, would as effectually preclude peculation, as the present voluminous display of figures.

The difficulty of examination is heightened by the intricacy of form, affording no positive good; the pay-lists are the repetition of every event of the several musters of the period, subjecting each name to the

investigation, of not only the figures, but the remarks of all intervening occurrences, producing no possible effect on the charge for the individual, except with regard to the allowance in lieu of beer, (which a soldier forfeits when on furlough,) being in the hands of the civil power, or being paid by a district paymaster.

A man deserving the indulgence of leave, merits the continuation of his pay during his absence; and as withholding the 1*d.* per day, does not deter him from soliciting a furlough, or hasten his return to his corps; the abolition of its suspension, could produce no other injury, than the inconsiderable excess of expenditure, and to this, the soldier might contribute, by giving up the allowance in stationary quarters and for procuring lodgings; which are such contingent advantages, that he would readily forego them, for the greater permanency of the other provision.

This alteration would remove from accounts, four columns of charge, and three of remarks, for if the soldier at home was always entitled to allowance in lieu of beer, it might as well be consolidated with his pay; and thus, it would be immaterial in finance how any man was disposed of, at the several musters, as, on whatever duty or situation, his claim on the public would be the same, (except in civil confinement,) which could be distinguished, without the column of muster, in that of remarks.

It is to be recollected, that no charge is to appear for any man, but in the regimental accounts, either through the paymaster or the agent, and therefore no objection will attach to this arrangement, from men being borne in district pay-lists, or being in general hospitals: in the latter case, the proportion of pay for their support, will in no instance become a separate charge against

the public, but will be defrayed by the paymaster or agent of the corps.

The pay-lists thus formed would contain simply, number of casualties, and full periods, names, period, number of days, if broken period, ditto, if whole period; amount of pay, and one column for remarks; this column would only explain causes and dates of casualties, men in civil confinement, and commencement of additional pay.

The extra pay to be distinguished by the muster being in distinct classes, and the names arranged in alphabetical order according to those classes in the pay-lists.

The only point to be provided for, is the statement of marches, which can be as effectually ascertained without being blended with the pay accounts. The route should accompany the charge, and opposite to each

day's march should be stated the number of men billeted, the total at the prescribed rate would constitute the expenditure; this, certified by the officer actually commanding the division, and supported by the signature of the commanding officer, is equally cautionary as the present mode; and though it may be urged this route requires examination, it is only an occasional occurrence, is a compact charge, and requires none of the innumerable references, of the present method, to be equally explicit.

The charge for baggage is also involved in a tedious form, and creates much vexation both to the accomptant and examiner: the commuted allowance simplified this head of service, but the occasional increase of rates has in part removed that advantage; to obviate which, the county choosing to advance the price should exclusively contribute for its payment; and though it may fall on some

districts in a greater proportion than others, being subject to the frequent march of troops, conveys with it more than atoning advantages, from the consequent contiguity to military stations.

It is unnecessary to speak of the third objection, as the preceding alterations would reduce the regulations to one fourth of their extent. I shall therefore proceed to trace whether these changes would be compatible with the public good.

The muster to be continued monthly in alphabetical classes, according to the claims for pay, the casualties to be enumerated in the same order, by themselves.

Monthly abstracts to be made by paymasters, but not in the present complicated form. In one line for the full periods, and

and another for the casualties of each class, and the particulars of the latter to be detailed.

The commanding officer and adjutant to certify the number of men of the different classes effective ; the correctness of the casualties and their causes, and particularise (if it should occur) whatever officers are absent without leave.

The half yearly pay-list to be alphabetical in classes, including the casualties in the same order, and as each class would show the total of days, and the amount at the ratio of its pay, if (at the foot of the whole pay-list), they agreed with the number of days, and amount of pay in the abstract of the same termination ; the accuracy of the account, would be in one view necessarily established,

The casualties being particularised from

month to month, both in the paymaster's abstract and adjutant's muster roll, would preclude the possibility of men being borne longer on the pay-list, than they were effective, and if any additional check was deemed necessary, so that a detailed report might leave the regiment more frequently, they could be expressed in the weekly state, to which there might be occasional references.

As the muster taken by the paymaster, is signed by the commanding officer and adjutant, the repetition of the occurrences in that muster, can be in no way useful in the money account, except as far as regard the charges already mentioned, and which are provided for. The paymaster could not misapply the public money, from this postponement of a detailed account, as the abstract would exhibit the monthly expenditure. On the contrary, the forms, by being more simple, would afford the com-

manding officer and adjutant more facility, to enter minutely into the charges, than the present statements will allow.

The public service could not be injured by the suppression of all intermediate accounts, either for absent soldiers or recruits; the requisite sums would be furnished by depot or other paymasters in urgent cases, and no inconvenience could attach to them for such advances, if indemnified for the increased postage they occasion; and it is a question, whether both absent soldiers and recruits, by frequent representation for assistance, would not more speedily reach their regiment, if districts did not afford such opportunities of supply.

It has long been a favourite topic to curtail the public charge, and the establishment of agents has afforded a plausible pretext

for the indulgence of that economy: it is true, their emoluments are considerable, but their employment is as important; and although the modern system of accounts, has deprived them of a great share of their original duty, there is enough left to justify their continuance: as the agents of the colonel, they are essentially necessary; and as the emoluments of a regiment would not enable the general to pay a person of requisite responsibility for the duty they perform; he must himself be exposed to the fatigue and intricacy of accounts, at a period of life when he required repose, or the country his services, or the regiment be subject to the inconvenience of irregularity; but beyond this, their duty as attaching to officers generally; in what a painful dilemma would numbers be placed, if the only channel of payment was the public purse; many highly meritorious men have not the blessing

of independence, and when ill health obliges an absence from colonial service, and when the calamity is heightened by the individual being obliged to seek the benefits of his native air, at his own expense (which unavoidably happens in many instances), he would be frequently incommoded if the rigid orders relative to his subsistence, were as rigidly enforced. In a public view, if agents were called on to exercise that extent of duty, which their original employment embraced, as the intermediate accomptant between the government and the paymaster, the country would not only be advantaged by the facility of final examination, but the paymaster be absolved, from the unjust responsibility of accounts, many years after their termination.

.

I am aware your Lordship is not connected with that branch of the public ser-

vice to which these arrangements apply, I have been induced to connect them with the original subject of my letter, they having resulted in a great measure from a detail of its principle ; and although I cannot expect they will be honoured with the approbation of those in power, I shall be amply recompensed, if they lead to an analysis of the present system, conscious that under such review, something more brilliant and more useful, than these humble suggestions, will emanate from the talents and industry which distinguish those conducting that department.

The voluminous extent of this letter has left no chance of private communication, and I can only flatter myself, it will now reach your Lordship; if there are any points which merit notice, by some intermediate channel; where greater leisure allows the

speculative perusal, of even productions
chimerical, and unrecommended.

I have the honour to be,

With the greatest respect,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's

Most obedient and humble Servant,

SAMUEL BRIDGE.

Jan. 1, 1809.

THE END.

OBSERVATIONS

ON

SOME OF THE MOST IMPORTANT PARTS

OF THE

ART OF WAR,

AS APPLICABLE TO THE PRESENT STATE

OF

MILITARY TACTICS IN EUROPE;

IN

WHICH IS POINTED OUT

A PLAIN, EASY, AND EFFICIENT WAY OF CARRYING INTO EFFECT

THAT PLAN OF OPERATIONS,

BY WHICH ALONE, IN THE AUTHOR'S OPINION,

THIS, OR ANY OTHER COUNTRY, WILL EVER BE ABLE TO RESIST

THE OVERBEARING POWER AND AMBITION

OF

THE PRESENT RULER OF FRANCE.

By JOHN GOURLAY, Esq.

QUOD PETIS, QUOD EST.---What you seek, is here. HOR.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR C. CHAPPEL, Pall-mall.

1809.

OBSERVATIONS,

&c. &c. &c.

IN the month of August last, the appearance, on the part of this nation, of a grand co-operation in the cause of the Spanish patriots, roused the attention of every military man in the kingdom. The General Orders that were issued at this time, for the whole army of England to hold itself in readiness for actual service, was a novel and a grand idea. Full of this animating subject, always ruminating upon it as I took my walk, I sat myself down one evening, and committed to paper the following reflections.

The mischievous consequences that will inevitably and quickly ensue, to the whole of the civilized world, if the French arms should ultimately prove successful in the present contest with Spain, which would give an unbounded range to the ambition of Bonaparte, and to

his revenge against this country, have led me to reflect on the state of military tactics, as practised by the different powers of Europe, in the several wars that have so rapidly followed one another since the beginning of the French Revolution.

The uninterrupted career of the French armies has continued so long, it has almost ceased to surprize. The greatest, and what have heretofore been the most warlike, portions of Europe, have already bent their necks, almost without a struggle, to the yoke; and it is in this country only we can now see any thing like a formidable army, which still disputes this boasted superiority, and which, it would appear, is preparing to support this opinion, at no distant period, in the field of battle.

If the whole world in arms is not able to get the better of this man, it would be more manly, in my opinion, as well as more merciful to the human race, to yield to him, and patiently to wait for some dispensation of Providence to bring about a change of things. But if it is fully and seriously determined upon to enter the lists with him, in fair and honourable warfare, on a grand scale, let us, for God's sake, act like men of experience, and make the best use of those powers and resources, which Heaven has so bountifully be-

stowed upon us, and not again contribute to swell the torrent of his vanities, and of his triumphs, by a feeble and paralytic resistance.

For my own part, I have not been able, for many years past, to contemplate this career of every kind of insolent and vulgar outrage on the one part, and an equal degree of base and womanish submission on the other, with any kind of patience; and I have in vain endeavoured to find out some principle, or distinct and decided superiority, to which to attribute the astonishing success of the French arms against the troops of all other nations, oftentimes equal, and sometimes confessedly superior to them in valour and discipline. But neither from my own general observation, nor from my little personal experience in military matters, nor from the written accounts of the various campaigns, which I have read with much attention, have I been able to discover that the French armies have been conducted, in a single instance, in battle, on any superior plan or arrangement that could, in the smallest degree, entitle them to this success; and the very great celebrity which their Generals have acquired does not appear to me to rest on any other foundation than what arises from a considerable share of personal courage, and an ardent emulation to distinguish themselves, on all occasions,

by every daring and strenuous exertion; to promote and encourage which, every kind of inducement has been held out to them by their cunning chief, with an unsparing hand.

This emulation, it will be confessed, is in itself no small ground of success; and in this, I am inclined to think, the French armies possess an advantage over all their opponents.

In action, the French make much more use of their artillery than any other nation, which has also given them a considerable superiority; so much so, as on some very important occasions decidedly to win the battle. This observation I would apply in a particular manner to the British army, whose Generals are too much in the habit of undervaluing this branch of the service, and are even studious (I think I have seen some instances of it) to find opportunities of throwing it into the back-ground.

The French Generals, for the most part, eagerly exert themselves to become the assailants, which is no small advantage to an army flushed with continued success, and vainly arrogating to itself that this can proceed only from superior ability, when, in reality, it is owing, in almost every instance, to the indecision and incapacity of their opponents.

But what has contributed more than any thing else to this career of victory is, the great

degree of ardor which has continued, throughout, to pervade the mass of the French armies, and which has, on every occasion, seconded, and even courted, the most vigorous exertions of their officers. During the revolutionary war, this ardor is easily accounted for. Men fighting for their liberties have, at all times, and in all countries, manifested a degree of vigour and perseverance which, when they could supply their armies in sufficient numbers, as the French have been able to do, always *has* been, and always *must* be, irresistible; and since that time their campaigns have followed so fast on one another, that this enthusiasm has continued to operate in full force, and even to encrease, so as to impress on their minds an idea that they are, in reality, superior to all other troops, and their leaders invincible; and there can be no doubt that it will continue to do so, with the same effect, until it is opposed by a bold and rapid decision, a system of warfare calculated to bring into action those superior energies which British troops, in particular, unquestionably possess over those of the French nation; and which, wherever they have been tried, have never yet failed of complete success. I here allude to the few occasions, and those on a small scale, where the bayonet has been resorted to.

I believe Suwarrow has been the only General

who has repeatedly, and I may say uniformly, beat the French. His marches were still more rapid, and his attacks still more vigorous, than theirs. He always chose the attack, and generally with the bayonet; and it is well known that their troops at last dreaded to meet him. By this we see their ardor was to be combated even in the heat of the Revolution; now it will be less difficult, because it is better understood. This way of fighting them, however, appears to have been more owing to the individual genius of Suwarrow, than to any principle acknowledged or existing in the Russian army; and it is now only to be wondered at, and lamented, that an example so glorious, a lesson so decisive and pointed, should have been entirely thrown away on the other leaders of armies.

I have never been able to reconcile to myself the possibility of *one man* directing the operations of 50, 60, or 70,000 in the field of battle, without some fixed and general plan to go upon, with which each subordinate commander should be intimately acquainted, and have his particular part to act, independent of all further general instructions; and this the more especially, when I see that *he* takes no lead or share in the action, but is merely a looker-on, leaving the orders and arrangements that may have been previously, and, perhaps, very judi-

ciously given, to all the chances and changes that must be unavoidably and incessantly taking place, after the battle has begun, and which it was utterly impossible for him either to foresee or provide for.

In the present desultory and inefficient way of fighting with musketry, from one end of such a line to the other, it must be evident that after the firing has commenced, it will be impossible to preserve any kind of regularity or connection in the line, for any length of time. No man knows what his neighbour is doing :--- One part advancing---another retiring---a third standing still---but all firing away their ammunition as fast as possible, as if the emptying of the soldier's cartouche-box was the aim and the end of his labours. But this musketry, it is well known, is seldom of the smallest use; on the contrary, it serves only to distract the attention both of men and officers, and prevents them from seeing what they ought to do, and what it is so essential they should be able, now they have got so near the enemy, distinctly to see. The commander in chief is as much in the dark as any other. He can only know the vicissitudes of the day from the report of an aide-de-camp; and if any thing very particular has happened, after a considerable lapse of time, though, perhaps, as soon as possible, he sends

his orders. These orders may be now no longer necessary, or they may be contradictory to such as have been already adopted. Hence follow uncertainty and indecision. If an advantage is within our reach, we are uncertain how to make use of it. If we are hard pressed by the enemy, this indecision makes us the less able to oppose it. *He* cannot be every where to guard against the exertions the enemy may make. Every thing is left to chance; and whether success or defeat is to begin on the right, left, or centre, is equally unknown to him, and equally unprovided for. In such a situation of weak and wavering exertion, is it not obvious that an effort made on any part of the line must succeed in forcing its way through, and thus in a moment to secure the victory? And, in truth, in this very way have the French won all their battles.

What are we to think of the battle of Austerlitz, which began at daylight, and continued to rage with desperate and unabated fury until late in the evening; and it was not till two o'clock P. M. that any decided advantage appeared in favour of the French? Is not this, at first sight, an exact and a woeful picture of a body without a head---a huge mass of inanimate matter moving by machinery, and incapable of being controlled by skill or ability? But let

us see how the French came at last to gain the victory. The unavoidable fluctuation and changes of place, occasioned by an incessant firing of cannon and musketry, so long continued, about this time separated the left wing of the Austro-Russian army from the right. The Russian Imperial Guard, which appears to have formed their reserve, and which was composed of a chosen body of infantry and *cavalry*, was ordered to advance, and re-establish the line. Bonaparte, who had taken his station in the rear of his centre, with his reserve near him, which consisted of twenty battalions of grenadiers and *forty guns*, saw this movement of the Russians, and instantly ordered up this force to oppose them. The conflict was such as may be supposed. It was severe, but it was short. The Russians, brave as they were, could not stand before the cannon of the French, and the battle was won.

Many very grand lessons may be drawn from this important battle, though it was certainly ill-managed on both sides. It has always appeared to me something like a contest, which of the two armies possessed the greatest degree of stupidity, and would stand longest to be fired at, without making the smallest exertion to rid themselves of the annoyance; and truly they showed a good deal of steadiness on both sides,

for I suppose there were not less than 40,000 men killed and wounded in both armies; when I am confident that, by a more decisive method, the battle might have been won at the expense of less than a fourth part of that number. How often might the fate of that dreadful day have been determined, by a little exertion on either side! Was this fighting for victory---for kingdoms---and in the presence of three emperors too? But the day was not lost from any fault in the men: they are always good. I am certain that Bonaparte had the battle of Marengo in his view, when he formed this incomparable reserve. It is a lesson that will last for ever, in the art of war.

I remember being present at a battle, in 1790, when the two lines stood looking at one another for seven or eight hours, during which time about a thousand men were killed and wounded with cannon shot; and at last, when the British troops did advance, the business was completely over in another hour, and without the loss of a hundred more men. If I recollect right, the reason assigned for this delay was, "to save the men."

To be the assailants, is to obtain, in some degree, the principal advantages of a regular plan, whether one has been laid down or no; and yet we see Bonaparte sometimes chooses the con-

trary, in order to lie in wait for the errors of his opponents, on which he seems to calculate not a little, and to consider as equal to some positive advantages. In this he has succeeded far better than he has deserved; but I venture to foretell, that so soon as he is opposed with a little method, and a good deal of perseverance, his career of truly disgusting arrogance and bombast will be at an end.

I have now been about twenty years in the army, and in that time have made several campaigns; I have reflected a good deal on what I have seen; and it has been on some occasions of actual service *the idea* I am now about to communicate first occurred to me.

I would propose that there shall be in our armies *one particular point*, perfectly and universally understood, *where, in battle, a great and united effort* is to be made, and to which all other operations are to be, in a certain degree, directed and subservient; and this effort I would make *entirely with artillery*, from a thorough conviction of the prodigious superiority of this branch of the service, when placed in proper hands. Musketry I would entirely abolish, except in particular circumstances. The number of guns for this purpose I shall at present say ten, and those 12-pounders, in one division, and placed in the centre of the line.

The object will invariably be, *a steady and resolute advance upon the enemy, not to be departed from on any account whatsoever*, until the line arrives within a proper distance, when *a general charge with the bayonet* will decide the fate of the day. The regiments will have their battalion guns as usual.

This is the *general idea*: many things will require to be explained and attended to, but the limits of this paper will only allow me briefly to mention some of the principal advantages.

This *centre division of guns* will form a strong and leading point in our line, *a thing hitherto wanted in armies*, to which every eye will turn, and on which every mind will repose with confidence, as on an able and active General who is to lead them into battle, and who is to bear a principal share in it.

By this the line will dress in advancing; and here it is that the first discharge will be the signal for the artillery of the whole line to commence firing.

From the number of guns at this place there will be produced a fire which nothing can withstand, and which will, at an early period, inevitably destroy the centre of the enemy; the shock of which will be speedily communicated to their whole army, and greatly facilitate our farther operations.

The exertions of the artillery along the whole line will quickly give the enemy a tolerably good earnest of what they have farther to expect, and will animate the infantry to a degree that cannot fail of success, when *their* exertions are called forth in the charge.

But above all, here will be a fixed and general plan, which every body knows, and nobody can mistake. Here will be no fluctuation or changes of place, except straight forward towards the enemy; and every one will know what he has to do, and see how he is to do it. I scarce think a battle fought in this way will almost ever come to the bayonet. If it does so the first, and possibly a second time, the ardor, the triumphs of the French will have seen their last days; and in proportion to their former gasconade will they sink into insignificance. I say this, because I do not think the French troops ever did possess spirit, or any kind of manly feeling, to be compared to the British; and because I do not think they have had any thing like real discipline in their armies ever since the beginning of their revolution.

It may be objected to this plan, that such an advance will occasion a great and unnecessary loss of men. This I positively deny. The loss will be considerable, no doubt, but it will be less than in the usual way, or in any other way.

The contest will be short, though severe. But to think of fighting without loss of men, is worse than childish nonsense. We must leave it to our Generals in parliament to talk of bloodless victories; our purpose is to win the battle as quickly, and with as little loss as possible, but at any rate to win the battle.

AN OLD OFFICER.

London, Aug. 12, 1808.

This paper was written without any intention, at the time, of its ever going beyond the precincts of my own apartments; but having read it over the next day, and every day for a week, and liking it better every time I read it, I took the liberty of sending a copy, exactly as it appears above, to an officer of very high rank in his Majesty's service.

It was not sent under a pompous pretence of having discovered any thing new. If there is any thing new in it, it is so very plain and obvious, that I should think it must have often occurred to officers who have seen service, as well as to me, and especially to officers of artillery. It was sent under an impression that in the then state of things it might possibly contribute something towards obtaining some fixed and general principle, on which to con-

duct the operations of a great army, when in opposition to such an enemy as the French. After having seen the general orders above mentioned, I naturally concluded that this would have become a point of the very first consideration and importance, and that it would have occupied, almost exclusively, the attention of the war minister, who appears to have the sole conduct and direction of our military enterprizes. Whether the above paper was ever seen by that gentleman I cannot pretend to say. That it was not honoured with any attention, we can only judge from circumstances. If this arose from the prevalence of better ideas on the subject, I am heartily glad that it is so; but if this was not the case, and this paper had not even the effect of suggesting the necessity of endeavouring to ascertain, and establish, something likely to meet the exigencies of an encounter between the armies of this country and France, better than what we have been accustomed to see; then I must say, I am sorry for it, but it is not on my own account. That something of this kind is at present very much wanted, I think is very clear. I make every allowance for the unaccountable and ridiculous system of committing the sole guidance of the war department of a nation to a minister, who, whatever may be his good in-

tentions, confessedly knows nothing, and can possibly know nothing of war matters: but exactly in proportion to this absence of every kind of necessary knowledge in himself, did I suppose he would have been the more accessible to a suggestion from other quarters.

If I was pleased with this idea, while I was only amusing myself with a solitary speculation on what might be done with a large British force, in the then state of Europe; I must be doubly so now, when I look back on the scenes of disaster and disgrace that have passed before our eyes since that time. When I so distinctly see what British troops are able to do, and what they have not done.

When we take a retrospective view of the military operations of this country during the few months since the above paper was written---our hurried and desultory equipments---our embarkings and disembarkings---the almost total want of artillery with our troops on all occasions---the inverse consequences that followed the successful skirmish at Vimiera---our subsequent progress into Spain---and our progress out of it---when we see all these things uniformly, and as it were, methodically following one another, as parts of the same system, one would be almost tempted to consider the above paper as a prophecy.

It would not perhaps be proper, at this present time, and in this public manner, to enter much farther into the detail of my idea how a great army should be conducted in opposition to the French, in the field of battle. The French Generals, I am sensible, would understand what I have already said on the subject, much better than our English ones; but until they possess the same materials for the groundwork of the piece, that knowledge would not be of much use to them against us. I shall therefore confine myself to a few more general observations, which I conceive to be intimately connected with my view of the subject. Having no interest, and therefore nothing to hope; and with not much to lose, having little to fear; if I do not give a free scope to my own observation and opinion on this point, it is solely because I do not think it would be altogether proper to do so. I have no great man in view either to flatter or offend; indeed I have never found the road to the favour of the great, either such as a man of honour would take from choice, or almost could take from necessity.

In a war with the present ruler of France, whether it is waged by the Austrians, or the Russians, or by this country, the only powers in Europe who can be considered on any footing of competition with him, as things stand at

present, when the fame of his conquests, and the idea of his superiority, have made so strong an impression, and must have so great an influence over the minds of the common people of all nations, it appears to me not only totally useless, but the very summit of folly, and of ignorance that will not learn, to think of such a thing as the plan of a campaign, until we have learnt to form and to carry into execution the plan of a battle.

While the opposite armies have been uniformly, at the beginning of a war, dividing their force, and marching into different parts of the country, often very distant from each other, and without having apparently any particular purpose in view, farther perhaps than to take possession of some insignificant places which they had far better be without, or to make some fanciful impression on the minds of the people, and rouse their energies, as it is called, and which they vainly think to do by the empty parade of an army marching among them; we have seen Bonaparte patiently waiting for a proper opportunity, and when he sees them sufficiently divided, and elated perhaps with some trifling success, which he will most probably have taken measures to throw in their way; and his troops being collected at a convenient place, to which he can easily repair in twenty-four

hours, from a distance of even 200 miles; he makes a dart at one of their armies, or at some particular object, and having succeeded in accomplishing this, which he takes care to ensure, by suiting his means to his purpose, he does not leave them one single moment, either to change their system; or to recover their loss, until, by a succession of victories, he has subdued the whole of their force and of their country : his succeeding battles operating in the most obvious and natural way, as the immediate and necessary cause and effect of each other. When his enemies have been considering him as not yet ready to commence operations, or, perhaps, that he is loitering away his time in hunting or other diversions, he suddenly makes his appearance at the head of his principal army, completely equipped for instant service, in the very heart of their country.

In former times great battles were only the result of many months marching and counter-marching, and were considered as the least part of the science of war; and a General was valued according to his ability in manœuvring, and spinning out the campaign, without the necessity of having recourse to one; and the want of money, or other means of carrying on the war, generally decided the contest. Now Bonaparte, like a true military genius, reverses

the system, and begins with them. He has calculated the advantages of this, and shows us the estimation in which he holds those advantages, by an invariable adherence to this rule. I think I may safely appeal to the whole of Bonaparte's military career for the truth of this observation. Nor is the uniform defeat and destruction of his enemies a less striking proof of the sterling value and rectitude of his judgment in this respect.

With this experience, then, before our eyes, with a perfect knowledge of the means, as well as manner, in which Bonaparte will make his *debut* on the theatre of war, wherever it is to be, does it not become absolutely necessary for any power, which pretends to cope with him in the field, to devise some plan of operations, some distinct and decided means, that will be equal to resist so unusual and so formidable a species of attack?

It was expressly with this intention in view, that in the month of August last I put together the outline of a battle, which, in my opinion, will be found, on trial, fully equal to the purpose. I repeat it, that it is only by conquering him in battle, and maintaining this conquest in defiance of his utmost efforts, that the career of his victories and usurpations will ever be checked. To bring his principal army, commanded

by himself, in preference, to action, as soon as possible, must be the sole aim and object of his enemy. For this purpose an army must be expressly prepared, completely equipped from the first moment it takes the field, and fully acquainted with the task it will have to perform; and it must think only, and act only, with a view to this object. If a better plan for conducting this army, on this very momentous occasion, than the one I have had the honour to propose, has been, or shall be suggested, of course that will become the preferable way: but be assured that something very unusual, and very efficient in every part, will be required, to give a turn to the fortune of Bonaparte. Beat him once at the outset, and follow it up exactly as he has shown how he has followed up such an advantage, and you have not only the plan of the campaign, but the campaign itself, in your possession. Let him beat you, and all the plans in the world will not be worth one single farthing to you. Success is the only criterion (and indeed it is most natural that it should be so) by which the common people of every country judge of the value of an army, either as friends or foes. Do you but change the current of his fortune, which has long run wanton for want of something like a proper resistance, and that opinion will change as fast

as you could wish it to do. Appear but as conquerors in any country, and you will find every thing go on smoothly and easily. You will no longer complain either of broken roads, or of bad provisions: every thing will flow in upon you with a willing profusion, even from the majesty of the multitude itself *en masse*, down to the countrywoman's contribution of carrots and cabbages.

It has always appeared to me most unreasonable to expect that the Spanish people, on a late occasion, would have flocked to our standard, and shown the most inveterate hostility to the French, when they never saw us in any other light than either advancing under the most evident symptoms of fear, or retreating with the precipitancy of complete defeat; and yet it would appear that this result had been confidently expected from the *appearance* of our troops in that country.

Let us suppose, then, that this plan of operation has been determined on---that it has been resolved, by some enterprising power, to meet Bonaparte in his own way, and to shew the world, in one great and determined struggle, before any successes on his side have had the usual effect of bewildering people's senses, and making them look up to him as something supernatural, whether or not he has a right to domi-

neer over it as he is now doing; I am perfectly confident as to the result of this contest, not only from a conviction that the means which I have proposed are fully equal to the purpose, but also from an opinion, which, though I believe it is not a common one, I have long entertained, that the general construction of a French army, is by no means that irresistible and unconquerable body which it has been too generally supposed. I shall detail this opinion.

That the French Generals are superior to ours, I am afraid cannot be doubted, as well in experience as in knowledge of their profession theoretical and practical. Here they certainly possess a decided advantage. I allow that their regimental officers are brave and enterprising in a very high degree; but I do not allow that they are more brave than our own officers of the same description; and as for their enterprize, it depends upon, and entirely flows from, their continued success. But with respect to their soldiers:---in an army of 60,000 strong, which I shall take as an example, I do not suppose there will be found more than 15,000 veteran soldiers; a like number will be conscripts who are not soldiers at all. Thus one half of the army is composed of native Frenchmen. The other half consists entirely of foreigners of every description and country---Swiss,

Germans, Danes, Dutch, Poles, Italians, &c. &c. a motly crew, who have been, in general, compelled by Bonaparte to enter his service, and who, most assuredly, would not continue in it a moment longer than they saw themselves successful, and likely to continue in possession of that plunder, and that consequence, which successful operations never fail to supply, in abundance, to the soldier of fortune. Reverse the picture, and they will not only hasten to quit his ranks, but will be eager to fight against him, and that with ten times more good-will than ever they have appeared to fight for him; for I do not admit that such men were ever staunch to his cause. Surely no one will think that such an army is to be compared to one of either of the powers that I have mentioned. That it would stand a single hour against a British army of equal, or nearly equal strength, on the principle which I have laid down, it would be high treason against every feeling of manhood to suppose.

That a French army, however, even thus constituted, does excel, us and all other armies, in every kind of manœuvre and rapid movement of the field, and also in the quantify as well as quality of their musketry, is very true; and it is for this very reason that I have suggested a plan of attack, (and equally applicable to defence,) which will effectually prevent their deriving any

advantage from this important and acknowledged superiority. These points, in which they so much excel, arise entirely from their continued practice of field operations; and the officers and old soldiers are always sufficient to establish and to familiarize, in a very short time, this ready movement, and this precision of fire, in their newest levies. Their advances to attack are also performed with a great deal of apparent vivacity and steadiness; but this is not real, it is founded on an idea that the enemy will yield to the appearance; and in this they have too often succeeded. I think we have had some proofs of this lately, both in Spain and Portugal, where they have ventured near enough just to get a taste of the British bayonet, and which they do not seem to relish at all. There cannot be a stronger evidence than this of the necessity, as well as utility, of introducing immediately into our war system a principle of rapid and decisive operations. It is exactly because we see the French do not like the taste of the bayonet that we should insist on administering it in large and frequent doses. This is the way to make war as war ought to be made, and it is the way, too, to shorten its duration, and in the end to save many lives. But, good Good! will not any General, any officer, any ploughman, or even any poltroon, be brave, and gallant, and

enterprizing to excess, when he sees himself constantly opposed to men who run away from him, or, what is still more flattering, who suffer themselves to be beat without giving him any trouble?

If we may judge from the spirit which our troops have at all times shewn, and especially under the late most disastrous and discouraging circumstances in Spain, certainly our soldiery never were in such a state of perfection and fitness for war, as they now are. Even at the close of that tragical scene, they met the enemy, and had always anticipated the result of such a meeting with enthusiasm. Their language has invariably been---Lead us forward---take us to the enemy---And they have been as constantly told, or it has amounted to the same thing---No, no, there's a chance you may be beaten---we'll carry you all safe back again to England.---With such troops, surely we need not be afraid to meet Bonaparte at any time: the greatest difficulties and even blunders might be overcome. With how much ease, then, would my plain and simple way of managing matters lead to a certain and decisive victory! It must, at the same time, be confessed, that with Generals who weigh too minutely, and too frequently, every possible contingency and chance in a battle, there can be no success. Even after having gained a de-

cided advantage, we have seen some of them absolutely frightened at their own good fortune, and weak enough to allow themselves to be persuaded, that they could secure the little ~~credit~~ credit they had gained, by the most dastardly sacrifice of the spirit and ardor of their own troops.

In my humble opinion it would have been a most desirable thing, an object of the greatest national importance, and what should never be lost sight of in our expeditions, to have got an opportunity of fighting the French, in any thing like a general engagement, on Portuguese ground, or on Spanish ground, or indeed on any rather than on British ground, at least for the first time. It is not enough that our officers and soldiers are sanguine in their expectations on this head; it would be of the greatest consequence to reduce this to a demonstration, for the benefit and information of the common people at large in all parts of the country, especially when we allow ourselves to look forward to the possible chances of one or two years more of modern confusion.* This strikes me very forcibly; and I shall take the liberty to give it as my serious opinion, that one of the greatest dangers this country has to apprehend, in these eventful times, is the decay of that generous and manly spirit which has lately pervaded our troops in so great a degree; or, what would be

infinitely worse, the perverting this spirit into a too obvious and most pernicious channel, which I much fear will be the inevitable consequence, if this dastardly system is much longer persisted in.

It is not in the nature of men, and least of all of the men of this nation, to suffer their spirit to be debased in this manner; and exactly in proportion to the real worth of such men, will be the degree of disgust excited by it. If such another business as that lately in Spain was to happen, I should not scruple to say, that in my opinion, every possible chance of saving these kingdoms from the grasp of Bonaparte was lost for ever. The bulk of the nation could not but participate in the feelings of the soldiery; they are the same people, and have the same interests and the same feelings on most occasions.

I am also firmly of opinion, that in these times it will only be by a regular army, cemented and held together by high military pride and emulation, that we shall ever be able to resist a French force; in the state in which it will doubtless be introduced, if ever it is introduced, into this country. I have nothing to say against the Local Militia, or any other *masse*; but to suppose that an armed multitude would be able or willing to make such exertions as only could be of any use against

such an enemy, would be to suppose that the nation would rouse itself to the very utmost in defence, and in support of, that very thing which they have of late years, on very many occasions, been accused of making the most outrageous efforts to shew their inclination to get rid of. I allude to what is called the corruption of the state. It is not my intention to touch on this point. These things may be remedied by degrees, but it is not by degrees that we must think of repelling an invader. This must be done effectually and at once, and that by a power which we hold immediately in our hands, and not by a reliance on any remote or doubtful contingency. As an invading army cannot be supposed to come well provided with artillery, my plan is particularly well adapted to give them a warm reception.

It appears to me to have been the greatest want among our generals, at all times, to know in what manner to begin a battle; how, and in what place, to bring the opposite lines near enough to one another to commence firing; and as this has been generally with musketry, it would of course require to be pretty close. They have been always averse to take any decisive step at the outset, least it should prove a wrong one. They have rather wished to wait and see what the enemy would do, than to have

any distinct idea of what they ought to do themselves. Their greatest concern always has been, least the enemy should extend his line farther than theirs, and by that means be able to break in upon their flanks; and truly this has not been without good reason, when we consider the length of time that has been generally taken to prepare for, and fight, a battle. Now the simple method that I have proposed effectually removes this apprehension; for the more an enemy extended his line, the more certain would be his destruction. This grand manœuvre (and it is reckoned the grandest of all manœuvres) of who should extend his line farthest, is certainly the silliest thing in nature: it is in fact contending who shall make himself weakest; and it carries on the face of it a conviction in the mind of the Generals, that there will be nothing very serious or obstinate in the business; that the battle will be, as usual, nothing more than a succession of skirmishes, each to be determined by a few rounds of musketry. This manœuvre would not answer at all, opposed to the short-work of artillery and the bayonet; and I can only regret that it is not likely I shall have interest enough to bring these two instruments into fashion, in the harmonious way in which I have arranged them. I know that our Generals think only of musketry; and if ever they do

condescend to make use of the bayonet, it is only in an occasional dash with a regiment, or at the utmost with a brigade, which is the most we have yet seen; and even this has only been when the enemy has forced it upon them by venturing too near. Artillery, on the scale in which I have the honour to introduce it to the notice of this nation, they have no idea of.

With respect to the best way of commencing an action, that has also been pointed out. *Advance your artillery and support it*, contains an easy and distinct way of doing this, and which is equally applicable to an army of 100,000 men, and to a single battalion. These few words contain the whole science of attack in field operations, unless you are near enough to use the bayonet without any previous preparations; and it will be entirely in the way in which this is done, that the degree and quality of the success will depend.

I must be permitted to say, that I do not think any thing will ever be done well in our army, speaking of it as on service, until the conduct and arrangement of our military expeditions are placed, where they certainly in common sense ought to be placed, in the hands of military men. Is it not astonishing to think, that after all the errors and blunders we have lately seen committed, and all the disasters and

disgraces that have been the consequence of these, we should still see those matters in the hands of a war minister, who, whatever may be his good intentions, or his ability in other matters, cannot possibly know any thing of the business he has undertaken to manage? How completely ridiculous would such an arrangement appear, in any business of common life! But even supposing that he was a military man, and perfectly adequate in this respect, his being one of the ministers would, of itself, be a most sufficient reason why the office should be abolished. Here we see our army, in the most important departments of it, at once thrown open to the whole ocean of parliamentary interest; and it is thus that we so constantly see the baneful effects of that interest at all times so conspicuous in the public disgrace. Whatever he does, and whoever he appoints to command, becomes a ministerial measure, and as such is carried through with a high hand. This is the way, in my opinion, in which the British constitution will die of an act of parliament, or more strictly speaking, of an act of the minister, if they are not one and the same thing. There is no one to suggest, or to digest, a military plan with him: even the Generals are not always consulted. Two of the best the service ever produced appear to have been sent off, on

a late occasion, more like criminals than any thing else, launched forth to go they know not where, and to do they know not what; and the moment they land, they find themselves assailed by a host of hundreds of questions, every one of them, at this period of anxiety and exertion, of less importance than another, but all betraying their common origin, in the fountain-head of every thing that is the very reverse of what is wanted in such an office. His plans are seldom known (to such military men, I only mean, as ought to know them) either in the design or the execution, until they are seen in the public newspapers as a subject of disgrace, or in the House of Commons as a ground of accusation. It is not from a person who knows nothing of war that martial ardor or enthusiasm is to emanate; nor is it possible to think, even allowing that proper officers were at all times consulted, that military knowledge and experience can assimilate, or associate itself in any degree, with the crude ideas of such persons on war matters. I believe it is not more than twenty years since this office of war minister was first established; to abolish it, therefore, would not be trenching so very much on ancient institutions; and it is no case in point to say that our naval affairs never flourished more than under First Lords of the Admiralty who were not

professional men. In this glorious service the *esprit du corps* is so perfect, so complete in every limb, that nothing short of confining them to port would prevent them from doing their duty. In a word, I shall say, *the pride of the navy rises with its rank; that of the army falls.* This is to me very plain, and easy of explanation, but I shall not enter farther into the subject---disgust is the chief ingredient.

I am induced to publish these observations at this time, from a belief that the most favourable time that can ever possibly occur to this country, for carrying into effect my plan, or some better plan, of decisive operations, as well as for obtaining the opportunity of meeting a French force, on a large scale, on foreign ground, at this moment presents itself, in a conjunction with an Austrian army. Thirty-five thousand British troops, and an equal number of Austrians, under this management, would chase Bonaparte round the world; only taking care to keep this army always complete to this strength, which would be no difficult matter in that country. Beat Bonaparte the first battle, which, if it is determined upon, certainly will be done, and the oftener you have occasion to fight him afterwards, you will like it the better, because it will be done the more easily. Indeed the greatest danger will be, that when you have

completely got the better of this *invincible hero*, you will become enamoured of this plan, and not know when to stop; and will be ambitious of taking up the cudgels, to follow his example in endeavouring to conquer all Europe. I am perfectly confident, when I speak in this positive manner, of the ~~certain~~ success of such an arrangement as I have proposed, in opposition to Bonaparte in the field of battle; nor do I think any officer can possibly doubt it, when he knows, and perhaps has seen, the immediate terror and confusion which even the appearance of a charge with the bayonet never fails to produce among the French troops; and there is no other way of obtaining the advantage of this weapon, on a large scale, that is to say, so as to embrace the whole of the enemy's line of perhaps sixty or seventy thousand men, but by some such arrangement. The fire of the artillery will be general from one end of the line to the other; the advance will be steady and uniform; the great distance between the regimental guns will give commanding officers an opportunity of seeing every thing that is going on, as much as they could wish to see it; in other words, we shall not be blinded by our own smoke; and this matters will be conducted with every precision as well as appearance of a regular, well-organized system; indeed infinitely more

so than any thing of the kind we have yet seen, until the moment of the charge arrives, which may be considered as the end of the battle. Let us not, therefore, lose the advantage which we see ourselves so completely in possession of, by being wanting to our own interest, in neglecting to embrace any opportunity of reducing this to practice. Let us not be eternally temporizing. In the war about to commence between France and Austria we might certainly find this opportunity. We ought to bribe the Austrians, if it was necessary, to allow us to assist them. Their officers are too brave and too enlightened to reject a plan of this kind, if it was laid before them; and the great advantage resulting to us from this conjunction will be, that in this case the whole weight of the commissariat, that stumbling-block of all our military efforts, will be entirely removed from our shoulders. Our soldiers will march, on such an occasion, with hearts as light as feathers, and their bayonets will enter as sharp as needles into the skins of the astonished Frenchmen. I hope something of this kind will be thought of, instead of employing 30,000 British troops in Portugal, the most wretched country and people in the universe. The French will never think of opposing such a force in the field, until they are able to do it with a very great superiority, and then to sup-

pose we shall retire to our transports. In the mean time, it will be merely a business of marching and countermarching, and taking possession of insignificant places for a few months; and will end in disgust and sickness among our troops. Let us either make war as war ought to be made, or drop it altogether, and save the expence. Let us not again contribute to swell the torrent of Bonaparte's vanities and triumphs by our feeble and paralytic exertions.

London, April 10, 1809.

FINIS.

Lately Published, By C. CLAPPLE, Pall Mall.

1. **A NEW MILITARY FINANCE**; containing the different Rates of Pay and Allowances for the British Army, according to the late Increase and Arrangement made in the House of Commons, and other advantages lately taken place in favour of the Staff. Price 4s. 6d. boards.

2. A new Edition of the **ELEMENTS OF WAR**, adapted for the Information of Young Officers and others, in the British Service. Price 5s. bds.

3. Humourous Comparisons and useful Remarks, interspersed with Ironical Advice for the Government of Military Arrangements. Price 5s. bds.

4. **STATE of the FOREIGN AFFAIRS of Great Britain**, for the Year 1809. By Gould Francis Leckie, Esq. Price 2s.

5. **The STATE of BRITAIN**, Abroad and at Home, in the eventful Year 1808. By an Englishman of no Party. Price 2s.

6. **AN HEROIC EPISTLE**, addressed to G. L. Wardle, Esq. M. P. on the Charges preferred by him against his Royal Highness the Duke of York, and the Foundation of those Charges By **MENTOR BRITANNICUS**. Price 2s. 6d.

Say, shall thy innovating hand invade
That Royal Tree, beneath whose sacred shade
The lib'ral Arts and Sciences have found
Beignant shelter on this favoured ground:
Where commerce flourishes, and freedom stands
A beacon to the hopes of struggling lands?

Vide the Poem.

7. **An ELAGIAC TRIBUTE** to the Memory of our much-lamented Hero Sir **JOHN MOORE**, By Mrs. **COCKLE**. Price 2s.

8. **THE INCONTROVERTIBLE PROOFS of the FORGERIES** contained in **MAJOR HOGAN'S APPEAL**, which will be given in Evidence on the Trial of the Informations filed by the Attorney-General against Peter Finnerty, and a variety of others, the particulars of which, with the names of the Parties, will be stated; including one Information for a Libel on His Majesty, several for Libels on the Duke of York, and two for Libels on the Duke of Sussex.

9. **A LETTER to Mr. CORBETT**, upon the alarming Secrets he has learned from **Major Hogan**. Price 2s. 6d.

